THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

Volume XIV APRIL, 1928 Number 2

OUR SPEECH STANDARDS

HENRIETTA PRENTISS
Hunter College

A JUST self-determination for the peoples of Europe seems to me no more difficult than an adequately comprehensive and a wisely exclusive definition of the word "ours" in the branch of educational activity known as "Speech."

Having passed through the period of pseudo-art commonly called elocution (although elocution has had its great artists and its fine expression as well as its quacks and its quackery), we are now entering upon a period of self-justification in which we would prove ourselves more scientific than the scientists, more factual than the historians, more logical than the mathematicians. Fortunately, most of us in our hearts own such allegiance to Art and Skill that I believe our teaching will never become purely academic.

To the man who reduces expression to pure thought, intelligibility is an adequate standard of pronunciation. The scientific phonetician recognizes any dialect in actual use. He will record all dialects, classify them and account for them, though for no dialect will he crusade. Like the phonetician, the artist's interest is in many dialects, not to observe and to classify so much as to master them and their inner life and spirit as well. He may in three successive plays or readings give us the Hoosier, the cockney and the cosmopolite, but while he is not interested in standardization there is a notable feature in the speech with which he interprets himself as apart from that of the characters he impersonates. It has distinction whether calling for admiration or protest from the listener. If protest, the fault may lie with the artist who,

being only a second rater or a fifth rater, is so in love with his voice and his speech that their obviousness conceals both the integrity of his thinking and the sympathy with which he meets his fellows—the tail is wagging the dog.

On the other hand, the fault may be with the one protesting, who sees bad in all that is unaccustomed and shies a stone at it. (What standardization is more rigid than a community's smug satisfaction with its folk ways and its speech?) Or the one protesting may be a man who sublimates his primitive objection to the unaccustomed, calls it nationalism and to be specific, if a Scotchman, decries all Scotch who do not roll their "r's" in defiance of the Englishmen beyond the border.

There are also in our ranks practical teachers who, whether familiar with the Gestalt Psychology or not, see the problem of expression as a whole, affecting every human being whose way through life may be marred or made in proportion as he effects or fails to effect team play between his inner purposes and his means of revelation. Practical teachers fall into two groups—those who, like the self-made man, never find fault with their maker, and being self-satisfied, have not taken steps to improve on the original act of creation; and practical teachers who are students, if not specialists, all the years of their life. It is only with the latter group that I am concerned.

To these the question of speech standards is as practical as is their attitude toward the whole problem of speech education. They cannot subscribe to one standard for all people at all times, yet they know that they must correct speech, that they must have a philosophy of correction, and concerted action to accomplish appreciable results.

Mr. Krapp in his last book, *The Knowledge of English*, has this to say in the chapter on "The Best Pronunciation:" "The main question at present, however, is not whether manifest defects should be corrected by training, but whether positive virtues, not merely a normal but a super-normal, a best pronunciation should be inculcated in the same way" (that is, by discipline). "This question can be answered most readily by drawing a parallel between speech and certain other aspects of personal deportment—the carriage of the body for example. If left to themselves children and others may carry themselves well, easily and uncon-

sciously. Such persons are said to have a natural grace, the best kind, possibly, that anyone could have. Yet such persons seem to be unfortunately the exceptions, not the rule. Every parent knows how insistently children must be directed to sit straight, not to shuffle, shamble, and slouch. It has been said that the final test of good breeding is the ability to walk gracefully across a floor before the eyes of an assemblage. A supremely unconscious person might do this, or a supremely self-conscious person, that is, one who by training has acquired complete control of the motions of the body. So also in speech, a well-bred, natural undisciplined pronunciation may be the gift of the fortunate few, but ordinarily, and in whatever associations one's type of speech is found, a certain amount of training is necessary to secure that certainty and fineness of control in speech which distinguishes the speech of the cultivated person from that of the boor. Just when this training should stop is a matter to be determined by observation of the subtle proprieties of cultivated speech. Certainly it should stop before it produces an impression of professionalism.... The highly trained manner of speaking which is so highly trained that it calls attention to itself is out of place on the plane of colloquial use."

The practical teacher starts with the assumption that "in whatever associations" his students' "type of speech is found, a certain amount of training is necessary to secure that certainty and fineness of control in speech which distinguishes the speech of the cultivated person from the boor." Now there is a long gradation between the speech of the boor and that of the cultivated person, and the wise teacher in beginning speech improvement with his children in a settlement class does not insist on the same standard that he exacts from his college boys and girls to whom he owes something of beauty and something of universality as he sends them forth to be citizens of the world. There must be a sliding scale of endeavor based on possibility of attainment.

The most fundamental standard is obviously intelligibility. When a young person says he was "to the 'men-a-gerry' yesterday," everything is left to our imagination, and the change from "men-a-gerry" to "menagerie" is more important than the change from "to" to "at." The lowest step in establishing intelligibility is the elimination of naïve mispronunciations.

May I be pardoned a digression here to protest against naïve imitations of forms intelligible to the British but not to us, such forms as "clark" (clerk), "shedule" (schedule), "figger" (figure) and "fertaisle" (fertile)? If I, an American, must choose between being intelligible to Americans and being intelligible to non-Americans, I prefer the former while I live in America. However, instances of difference between American and British pronunciation so great as to interfere with intelligibility are few. The great bulk of pronunciation shows identical usage by fine speakers (I define later what I mean by "fine speakers") on both sides of the water, and the obvious unlikenesses in speech are due not so much to pronunciation as to the different melodies in which we speak.

The next step in establishing intelligibility is the correction of mispronunciations due to the influence of the foreign born who will be our "fellow citizens" of tomorrow. We have ever the battle against foreign English, though I myself find "finger" rhyming with "singer" not more objectionable than mispronunciations common in the unlettered native—mispronunciations such as "acrost" (across) and "ast" (asked) and "fergit" (forget). I cannot sympathize with Boards of Examination who reject candidates with some slight foreign accent but with cultured voices and an exquisite sense of the value of speech, while accepting candidates with no trace of foreign accent but with unlovely voices and indifferent speech. However, the way of the examiner is hard

It may be asked why I do not place unintelligibility caused by defective speech before naïve mispronunciations and unintelligibility due either to foreign accent or to native illiteracy. Defective speech caused by malformation or wrong functioning lies in the field of the specialist in speech correction rather than in the field of the general practitioner, and is therefore outside the scope of this paper.

No standard of pronunciation that interferes with fluency can be satisfactory. Therefore fluency itself becomes a standard. Fluency is a principle frequently violated in the classroom where teachers often work for syllabic precision at the expense of that normal English rhythm which is gained in large part by the weakening of vowels in unaccented syllables. "The judgment" is not pronounced like "the judge meant." Neither has the second

syllable in "Sunday" identical pronunciation with the second word in "some day." Closely allied with this weakening of vowels in unstressed syllables is the weakening of unimportant words used for grammatical form rather than content—such words as "and" and "the" and "of" and "to" which have double and sometimes treble pronunciations according to their position in the phrase.

The subordination of secondary to primary stress to avoid the "klop klop" speech of the plod horse is also an essential to fluent rhythm. We criticize our British cousins for such contractions in pronunciation as "labretri." (laboratory) and "histri" (history) and "secretri" (secretary), but we in America err as much in over accentuation when we speak of the "dictionairy" (dictionary) and the "librairy" (library). Over-accentuation is an enemy to fluency and rhythm.

Another vital factor in fluency is the recognition that English has its liaisons as well as French, binding our words together so that a phrase is really a thought-word, a continuous utterance with no acoustic separation between the verbal parts. The injunction "don't run your words together" is fatal both for meaning and fluency.

After intelligibility and fluency I would place ease, not social but physiological, the power of speech without vocal strain. A baseball pitcher must get his ball over the plate, he must serve a speedy ball; but with all his extraordinary gyrations he can never afford to sprain his ligaments or dislocate his arm. Tomorrow's game is as important as today's.

We have, superimposed upon each other in our jaws and throats, the antipathetic functions of speech and of snatching, tearing, holding and gulping. In the brute man, speech had much of brute noise. With the progress of civilization, we are getting speech out of the throat, encouraging the making of sounds as far forward as possible, keeping the mass of tongue away from the larynx, that the vocal cords may not be impeded in their vibration; relaxing the muscles of feeding that the more delicate muscles of voice may play unhampered and unexhausted. We hear this difference even today in the speech of the cultured and the uncultured man. Mr. Krapp notes the tendency to pronounce the sounds of English further forward and with more lip-action as we progress

from Anglo Saxon to modern English. While he withholds unqualified approval from the theory of "ease of utterance" as a causative factor, he recognizes the probability that it is "a principle of some importance in explaining the changes in Engish sounds." Were he a teacher of voice as well as a scientific phonetician, he might accept as more conclusive the theory that slight variations in pronunciation make great difference in ease of production.

Beauty is a fourth standard, inherent I believe in intelligibility, fluency and ease but needing consideration by itself. Phoneticians may laugh at the idea of one sound having more beauty than another, and I agree that difference in the relative beauty of whispered sounds is negligible, but once consider articulate sounds in relation to voice, and not only does ease of production assume importance, but beauty becomes a vital factor also. For this reason Italian is the favorite language of singers. Spoken Italian is beautiful, too. While we cannot invent an English which shall be as favorable for tone production as Italian we can choose among English dialects the one that lends itself to beauty. All things being equal, open tone passage makes for beauty of speech. This seems to me an argument for the use of the vowel in "far" in such words as "aunt" or "class" rather than the vowels of either "fair" or "fat."

Unimpeded tone passage makes for beauty of speech. Tip of tongue down and out of the way is more favorable than tip of tongue up. The strongest argument against the inverted vowel, the vowel made either with tip or front of tongue up, because of the influence of a following "r" in the spelling is, as Angela O'Byrne has remarked, that it is impossible to prolong the sound without caricaturing it. A long, beautiful inverted vowel cannot be made. A vowel that is unobjectionable only when uttered so rapidly that it can hardly be heard is not an element of strength in a language, for the value of vowels in speech is their holding power. The hybrid offspring of a vowel mated with the fricative alveola or palatal "r" can not hold its own either in an endurance test or a beauty contest with any unimpeded vowel.

I come finally to universality of understanding as a criterion of good speech. If there is a literary written English so free from geographic tags that a critic would be hard put to detect the birth-

place of the author, I believe there should be a literary spoken English equally free from localisms, the possession of every educated man. Let the educated man use his native dialect when he speaks to the heart of the "home folks," but let him have also a form which proclaims him a man of the world and opens for him the way to universal understanding—that is, the understanding of English-speaking people the world over.

You may ask where to find this "literary spoken English," which has thrown off its localisms. Persons whose ancestors have been English and educated for generations back, who have been lifted out of provincialism by travel, and who are not professional teachers of speech, nor aware that their speech is being noted, these are the men and women who naturally use a form of speech, practically uniform in pronunciation, wherever their birthplace and whatever their melody, an English which is intelligible, fluent, easy of utterance, beautiful, and universal in power of comprehension by English speaking people. Many of our finest actors have acquired this form of speech as have many others in every profession through training, education and cultural opportunity. Can we find a written record of this speech? Webster's New International Dictionary indicates it to the man who has read and is able to understand the "Guide to Pronunciation" in the preface and applies that guide to the pronunciations indicated in the main body of the dictionary. Jones' and Palmer's Phonetic Dictionaries of English indicate it. Daggett's records give it.

It is questionable whether anyone not phonetically trained can use these dictionaries. It is questionable whether anyone not phonetically trained ought to teach Speech. The process must be to train the ear, to train the organs of speech and to develop a scientific method of notation. Finally, improvement in speech must be slow for the processes of assimilation and gradation must take their quiet way. At no time should the unity of thought and social relationship be destroyed for petty or too quick perfection of prounciation. The least must not swallow up the large.

A HIGH-SCHOOL COURSE IN SPEECH*

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT
Petoskey High School

INCLUDED herewith is a brief resumé of the Course in Speech I am presenting at Petoskey High School this semester. Please do not think I offer this as an ideal outline for one semester of high-school work. I am laboring under no such illusion. I present this simply and humbly as the plan I have worked out to meet the particular situation I face.

You are undoubtedly all familiar with the report just put out this year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,—a report on *The Quality of the Educational Process in the United States and in Europe*. This report is not a scathing condemnation of our schools, but it is a friendly and needed and indisputable warning that our schools have some shortcomings that need consideration and I want to explain the details of the accompanying outline remembering three criticisms of the high school pointed out by the Carnegie Report: (1) Lack of a unified building curriculum, (2) failure to prepare the students in the mother tongue, and (3) too much attention to the poor student with not enough attention to the superior, on whom the nation is ultimately to depend for leadership.

I believe the speech class can to a great extent free not only itself but the high school as well from each of these charges. I spend a great deal of time in the class creating the conception in the mind of the student that speech is the crowning achievement of man, the unifying achievement. No subject has such power to unify the student's conception of the high-school course and make him see the value and place of all his work as has the speech class.

Certainly it offers training in the mother tongue,—a training that is not only needed, but that the pupils are anxious to receive. The third charge of the Carnegie Foundation Report, that the school neglects the superior pupil for the mediocre or worse, is also one that the speech class can readily escape. For instance, I give the brilliant pupil a much longer selection to memorize than I give

* Read at the Cincinnati Convention, 1927.

the slower pupil. I try to make the pupils think of their work each time not in terms of a grade which is a certain per cent of perfection, but rather in terms of a grade which is better by so much than their previous effort. I enjoy the speech class because it has this great advantage of adapting itself readily to the ability of the individual pupil.

Now if you will refer to the outline you will note first the aim of the course: "To improve the speech of the individual pupil." I have always felt that it may be best sometimes to aim at something we can attain even if it does not make so idealistic an appeal. Please remember that my definition of speech is a broad one including the whole man in the desired improvement. I think of speech in the modern conception as "the mirror of the soul" indeed, but also as the barometer of health and of success in life itself.

You note the text used: *Better Speech*, by Woolbert and Weaver. I think it presents the finest and most valuable background of theory for the student to work from. The chapter on Reading, the presentation of the Tests of Good Speaking,—in fact the entire book is well written from the standpoint of interesting the pupil of high-school age. Nor are there at lot of unnecessary details.

You will notice that the first-semester course is divided into three units of work. The first of these is devoted to study of the theory, aiming to develop an appreciation, understanding, and beginning practice of good speech with all the elements, including voice and gesture, that go to make it up. The second unit deals with reading both from the standpoint of theory and of practice,—in reading from the printed page and from memory. Unit three completes this very practical and basic training; it is devoted to the delivery of original speeches varying in length from three to ten minutes.

I call your attention to the supplementary requirements which might be likened to the famous book reports of the English courses. The artist studies models before beginning his own creative work—so should the speaker. Furthermore, in spite of the best efforts of teachers in the lower grades, even Juniors and Seniors do not know how to outline efficiently,—or in some cases any way at all. Therefore I require, to be handed in before the Thanksgiving va-

cation, complete-sentence outlines of six speeches, selected from some of the more interesting by Roosevelt, Coolidge, Depew, Grady, Webster, Curtis, Beecher, LaFollette, Lloyd George, and others which happen to be available in the reference library. The six outlined must be selected from a mimeographed list which is given the student along with a model outline. After Thanksgiving a day is devoted to discussion of the outlines presented.

The student's observation is also drawn upon by requiring three reports on speakers to be handed in at the same time as the outlines. These may be on local ministers or any speakers the students hear before the assembly or elsewhere. These reports include the four things mentioned on the accompanying outline. In addition to these three, of course, short reports as daily assignments are often required on readers, local debates, speech contests, plays, and other programs of that sort which most or all of the students attend but are never required to attend. These reports and criticisms, it is always understood, are not made in a fault-finding way. The aim of this work is to develop power of observation and make the pupils critics,—not criticasters.

The first day I secured as much insight as possible into the individuals enrolled and their probable beginning abilities. I spent some time giving a brief outline of the course and just what would be expected. The assignments from the text were made for the week. On the second day I gave out the selections for the memorized readings. I had at hand copies of college orations cut to the desired lengths, but mimeographed copies of selections from some speech such as Conwell's *Acres of Diamonds* would be equally satisfactory. Each pupil was asked to read his or her selection at the next meeting of the class before starting to learn it in order that some faults in poor emphasis, pronunciation, and the like might be prevented, an ounce of prevention in the speech class being worth two pounds of cure. The theory and first-talk assignments on the outline are self-explanatory.

The second week is occupied with the first delivery of the selections from memory. No criticisms are made as to gestures and position unless they are terrible, or the pupil is beyond the nervousness of the first appearance before the class. Getting the thought and communicating it is the idea stressed. From this first delivery of the readings I compile a list of the words mis-

pronounced or used as if the meaning might be hazy and assign the looking-up of pronunciation and meaning of these to the whole class. Throughout the course vocabulary-building by this method is an objective.

The third week offers the first mention of the importance of the whole body to speech and is devoted to chapter three in the text on this topic. The exercises at the end of this chapter are especially valuable. There is given a list of ideas that are to be conveyed to the class by pantomime and some by a combination of words and actions. The students enter into this quite readily in a competitive spirit to see who can present the idea the more clearly.

The fourth week sees, as you note, the final delivery of the memorized selections, short three-minute talks on topics which seem to be such that the student does not have to worry about forgetting and can give all attention to delivery, and a day devoted to discussion.

The fifth week is one of detail study devoted principally to pronunciation and articulation and based rather rigidly on the work suggested in the text. I want to say right here that I never feel that I accomplish a great deal with special voice exercises. I secure much more satisfactory results by using parts of the pupils' speeches or memorized selections for such a drill.

The sixth and seventh weeks complete the first unit. A contest is held. Each student brings to class some selection, humorous or serious, and is given from two to three minutes to read this. The class then votes to select the most interesting selection and also the best read selection. This contest provides a spicy program and sees each student putting forth the best possible effort. A review of the first four chapters is followed by the unit examination.

The class whose program I am presenting numbers twenty-three, a little large for the best speech work. Ordinarily the pupil appears before the class for a major assignment only once per week, never more than twice. To have the student appear oftener might make the occasion too ordinary and thus secure less than his best effort.

You note that the second unit begins with a short talk on how to make something. This serves two purposes. It adds interest and it shows the students' natural conversational voices when they are telling in their own way how to do something they

are interested in. This is the voice that it will be most desirable to work for in the coming reading. The announcement of the oration assignment for unit three is also made here in order that the student may be thinking about that.

You note that unit two requires the delivery of the same reading three successive times, demanding improvement along certain specified lines each time. I firmly believe that the giving and regiving of this one reading until it is delivered well is more valuable practice for the student than would be the giving of three different selections each only once. I try in these selections to get the students to speak naturally and with force. I often stop them in the midst of their reading and ask them to paraphrase what they have been saying, talk with them about its meaning and thus by every possible device work to get them to communicate the maximum possible meaning.

Each pupil selects his or her own reading with the consent of the instructor; and it may be in verse or prose, humorous or serious. As the theory studied throughout this unit is sufficiently presented on the outlines, I will not go into further detail concerning it. On the first delivery of the reading criticisms are limited largely to enunciation, pronunciation, clearness, and proper meaning. Elements of proper feeling, appreciation, and forcefulness are next emphasized; and it is finally expected to be delivered to the best of the student's ability.

I introduce a day of discussion or devote a part of a period to it whenever the opportunity presents itself, and I believe this is a very valuable exercise. The twelfth week opened with discussions on such topics as: College Education vs. Business Experience and Working for Marks vs. Working for Learning. Leaders were assigned to open the discussions. A careful review of the chapter on reading is followed by a detailed unit examination covering theory studied.

Now comes the last unit of work and perhaps the most practical. This is devoted very little to a study of theory but almost entirely to practice in the giving of talks. Complete sentence outlines emphasizing the three divisions, introduction, discussion, and conclusion, are demanded and no talk is heard unless the outline has been handed to the instructor on time. One thing I find my-

self weak on but which is absolutely essential is the insistence upon having the student's best effort, on time, on every assignment.

Talk I in this group is based on the pupil's personal observation. This is an adaption of the exercise given on pages 212-13 of *Oral English and Public Speaking* by Shurter and Tower. Among the topics suggester are: A Ride in an Airplane, An Hour in the Assembly, Personal Recollections of a Great Man, My First Visit to a Large City, and Near-By Places of Interest to Travelers. All of these are well adapted to the local situation and some of the boys who caddy at the surrounding summer resorts told some tremendously interesting recollections of great men they had caddied for.

The second series of talks demanded demonstrations of something and proved very valuable training as well as of unusual interest to the class. We were told, and told interestingly and well, with demonstrations of the actual paraphernalia or by drawings on the blackboard how to do a great many things. I mention just a few: Tennis, Paper Flowers, Rope Tying, Driving a Car, Golf, Model Airplanes, Moving-Picture Machines, Lamp Shades, and Football. These talks would have provided interesting programs anywhere and, being demonstrations, forced the students to use their hands and arms and developed action.

The third talk aims to spur the imagination. The student is required to give a three-minute talk on some imaginative topic like those suggested in the text, Exercise 4, Page 208,—topics such as: The Center of the Earth, Aviation in the Year 2000, etc.

All of the theory the student studies during this period is presented by the instructor and is brought in during the criticism of talks or in lectures like the one listed for the thirteenth week on "Attention." This is based on the psychology of attention and its application to the speaker and significance for him.

Talk IV is a longer one, of five-minute length. The procedure is sufficiently explained by the outline. Some of the most successful topics suggested for this assignment are: American Humor, Pioneer Life in Michigan, Popular Superstitions, The Colors of Sunrise and Sunset (The Million Dollar Sunsets across Little Traverse Bay are famous), Popular Idols, American Football, Radio, Seeing America First. These topics might not prove successful in other regions but certainly have brought out some very good talks

from Petoskey students. Too often in the past there has been a failure to adapt the speech assignments to the individual and local interests. Last year I had one boy in class that I despaired of ever getting interested. Then one day I suggested among other topics "Trout" and that boy gave one of the most interesting talks of the semester.

I might say a few words about the handling of class criticism. Variety and keeping all attentive is one objective as well as the development of critical ability: the appreciation of good as well as the recognition of poor speaking. Sometimes I call for the volunteering of oral criticisms after each speech,—again I wait until all have spoken then take up the criticisms together. Occasionally I require that written criticisms be made and handed in. For the longer speeches once each semester I like to use a class criticism card adapted from that used in the Beaver (Pa.) High School and printed in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*. I use a less detailed form which I run off on the mimeograph but it could be placed on the board and used as a model only. On each of these appears the name of the critic and the speech and speaker criticised. It calls for criticism first, of the speaker as to first impression, attitude, and courtesy, and second, of the speech—as to delivery: conversational quality, language, voice, action, and gesture—and as to content: purpose, interest, outline, and illustrations. These are suggestive only and provide good thorough criticisms, which are first handed to the instructor and then passed on the following day to the student criticised.

The short week preceding Christmas was devoted to a discussion of the oration outlines and suggestions for their improvement. These outlines will be improved and the orations written or completed so as to be ready to be handed in the seventeenth week. As a bit of variety in keeping with the coming Christmas season I introduced here what I believe to be a very valuable exercise: the relay reading of an interesting story taken from one of the current magazines. The one that proved most satisfactory in this case was "Where There Isn't a Will There's a Way," by Ellis Parker Butler in the *American Magazine* for November.

You notice the extremely valuable and practical work following the vacation period, which does not, I believe need much

further explanation. Impromptu talks, telling of anecdotes, presentation and acceptance speeches in which the class is paired off, and discussions occupy the time before the oratorical contest, when the delivery of the orations counts as the unit test. The best two or three in the class enter the school oratorical contest.

The last feature planned provides an actual occasion and adds much zest to the study of the after-dinner speech. The students plan this entire affair, program and all, and last year it was so successful that I intend to repeat it. It takes the form of a farewell banquet with speeches that are not boresome.

Remember the aim of this course has been to improve the individuality and genuine effectivenes of each student's speech. I have omitted many things you might be interested in because I do want to review very briefly the second semester course too.

The second semester course as I have organized it at Petoskey deals with practical speaking almost entirely. With the present status of the speech course in the University list of accepted credits, many students have time for only one semester of speech work in the high school; it therefore seems advisable not to make Speech I a pre-requisite for Speech II.

I like the second semester course as it was organized last year very much and it can, of course, be improved. In the first place, it deals with some things I have always felt every potential citizen needs to be taught. These are: some fundamentals of etiquette and common every day (and evening) courtesy; a study of conversation, both business and social,—something besides the weather; a knowledge of parliamentary practice; and a study of reading and extempore speaking with practice in the delivery of speeches for special occasions.

In this course the same text is used. For the work on conversation and etiquette I follow rather closely the work presented and exercises suggested in Craig's *Speech Arts.* I use the mimeograph freely for the assignments to the students. In parliamentary law occurs another deficiency of the Woolbert and Weaver text and I present this subject entirely by the lecture method with the aid of mimeographed tables and other details for the student to learn. Many days are devoted to Parliamentary Practice, with the entire class meeting as the Student Council, City Council, Chamber of Commerce, or other organization and attempting to conduct itself

as such. The students will work hard on parliamentary law with the least urging of any assignment I know, and groups will spend much time looking up all details in order to carry or defeat some project. Also in the debate on the motions comes some excellent speech practice. I believe this is a real preparation for active citizenship—the kind every community needs more of.

The speeches required in this second semester course are of two kinds. First, there are four talks modelled closely after assignments in *The Speech Arts* by Craig. Talk I of these is an appreciation talk on contemporary men and women of achievement. Talk II deals with animals: their homes and habits. Talk III is based on good citizenship. Talk IV has as its topic vocations and in it the student is supposed to be addressing a High-School Senior Class urging them to take up some one vocation.

The second group of talks takes up much more thoroughly than is possible in the first semester the speeches for special occasions. Announcements, introductions, presentations, acceptances, welcomes, farewells, toasts, and after-dinner speeches are studied and given. It is difficult to imagine that there are any for whom this training will not prove of practical value.

There is, of course, some supplementary work in the form of outlines for speeches, together with reports on speeches heard, and a study of models of speeches for special occasions.

This completes my subject, "A High-School Course in Speech."

To conclude briefly: The high-school speech course fills a real need in the advancing and broadening curriculum. It not only provides a much-needed training in oral expression,—it is a unifying force in the rather disconnected realm of subjects offered the high-school pupil; and it is a course in which adaptation to individual abilities can be most nearly achieved. It provides opportunities for training in moral citizenship which the front pages of our newspapers would seem to indicate is needed.

I have presented this course not as an ideal one but rather as a practical course that is working and securing results. It has been gradually evolved to meet the high-school need as that need presented itself and at the same time to fulfill the requirements proposed by the Syllabus Committee of this Association. If I have made any contribution toward the solution of our mutual problems

I am indeed thankful. If I have done no more than to arouse criticism and suggestions I am sure these at least will be helpful.

SPEECH I

PETOSKEY HIGH SCHOOL—FIRST SEMESTER

1927-28

Rupert L. Cortright, Instructor

AIM: TO IMPROVE THE SPEECH OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT.

TEXT: BETTER SPEECH (Chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4, & 9)—Woolbert & Weaver.

UNIT ONE: Fundamentals of Speech,—what they are, importance of, study of.

FIRST WEEK: Assignment of first readings and reading of same before the class. Study of Chap. I—"Good Speech," with much class discussion. Each student tells the class of some interesting experience.

SECOND WEEK: First delivery of selections from memory with careful criticism and suggestions. Study of Chap. 2—"The Four Phases of Speech." Study of pronunciation and meaning of words from readings.

THIRD WEEK: Careful study of Chap. 3—"Mastering the Whole Body for Speech." Much practice of exercises at end of chapter. Examination.

FOURTH WEEK: Second and final delivery of selections from memory. Study of voice and breathing, pages 67-77 of the text. Three-minute talks on "Petoskey's Most Valuable Citizen and Why," or "Petoskey's Greatest Advantage and Why." Class discussions on The Tipping System, Requiring Study of Shakespeare in High School, and Peace at Any Price.

FIFTH WEEK: Study of text, pages 77-104, involving the Sounds of American Speech, Articulation, and Pronunciation.

SIXTH WEEK: Complete the study of Chap. 4—"Voice," with attention to tone, strength of voice, rate, pitch, and the elements of emphasis. Much practice in class of readings from text and reference books.

SEVENTH WEEK: Students bring selections to class to read. Review. Examination.

UNIT TWO: Intensive Study and Practice of Reading.

EIGHTH WEEK: Each member of the class tells how to make something. Announcement of oration assigned for unit three. Study of the kinds of reading from the first part of Chap. 9 of the text. Reading before the class of selections chosen to be memorized.

NINTH WEEK: Study of the Kinds of Meaning in Reading, the Reading Vocabulary, and the Perspective with exercises from the text. First delivery of the selected readings from memory.

TENTH WEEK: Study of the Paraphrase with exercises from the text.

Written paraphrases and perspectives as well as oral required. Second delivery of memorized readings.

ELEVENTH WEEK: Completion of Chap. 9—"Reading." Last delivery of memorized readings. Discussion of subjects selected for orations.

TWELFTH WEEK: Discussions, Review, Unit Examination.

UNIT THREE: Preparation and Presentation of Original Speeches.

TWELFTH WEEK (Last two days): Talk I, Shurter and Tower, page 212.—Personal Observation or Experience, 3 min. Lecture by Instructor on "The Oration."

THIRTEENTH WEEK: Talk II, Craig, page 194-5. Demonstration Talk, 3 min. Talk III—Imaginative Talk, 3 min. Lecture by Instructor on "Attention."

FOURTEENTH WEEK: Outline for Talk IV handed in, criticised, and returned for improvement. Talk IV—On Suggested Topics, 5 min., Class criticism cards used. Study of pages 268-84 in text, concerning outlines.

FIFTEENTH WEEK: Oration outlines presented, discussed in Class, corrected and handed in before Holiday Recess. Relay reading of Christmas Story.

SIXTEENTH WEEK: Impromptu talks—"How I Spent my Vacation." Telling of Anecdotes. Discussion.

SEVENTEENTH WEEK: Oration manuscripts due. Discussion of presentation and acceptance speeches and giving of these. Written criticisms of interclass debate held in the Assembly.

EIGHTEENTH WEEK: Delivery of Orations. Review of principles of gesture and practice of gestures based on exercises in text, pages 63, 66. The delivery of the oration is counted as the unit test.

NINETEENTH WEEK: Review. A dinner in the lunch room with a program of after-dinner speeches is the concluding activity of the course.

SUPPLEMENTARY WORK: (Due Nov. 23, at end of Eleventh Week.)

REPORTS ON THREE SPEECHES to include:

1. Speaker, Occasion, and Subject.
2. Criticism from standpoint of three tests of good speaking.
3. Outline of the Speech.
4. Discussion with the four phases of speech as a basis.

OUTLINES OF SIX SPEECHES FROM A GIVEN LIST.

PERSONALITY CHANGES

BRYNG BRYNGELSON
University of Minnesota

FOR a number of years it was believed that heredity was solely responsible for character traits in man: criminals were born to be criminals; misbehavior in children was accounted for by the theology of "original sin." Discipline became a matter of attempting to eradicate the sin—as if the sin were in itself a physical entity like an appendix or a tumor, the removal of which would cure all ills of the personality.

In quite recent years, folks who have studied human behavior by means of scientific methods have concluded that the "sin" was merely a superstitution and that the children came into the world unmoral, that is, neither moral nor immoral; that their status of morality depended largely, if not wholly, upon the training from their environment; and that the discipliners themselves simply rationalized their tempers and their own emotional problems under the guise of "original sin" and "holy wrath."

Treatment in the light of the older philosophy of fabrication and superstitution undoubtedly effected personality changes. Human beings were changed from positive personalities to negative personalities, and from inherently negative personalities to positively overcompensated extroverts. Most of the failure of present day programs of child guidance is due to the persistence of these false conceptions of such entities as sin, crime, and personal responsibility.

The history of the treatment of speech disorders reveals a similar transformation in theory. Biologically considered, speech is an instrument of adaptation to the social environment. It is one of the most complex and highly developed functions of the human organism, and has become such a facile and far reaching instrument of expression and control as to be considered the one most important personality trait.

The development of speech is bound up with the development of intelligence and the emotions; consequently it is bound up with behavior and personality. The social value of speech can-

not be over-emphasized. It is a short-cut to action, a short-hand method of controlling proximal and distant situations by a statement, an inflection, a change of intensity or of pitch, and so on. Admitting speech to be the important social instrument that it is, we recognize that those who are incapable of using it effectively—i. e. "speech defectives"—will naturally reveal a great deal of poor mental hygiene; in the first place, those who are denied a normal speech outlet because of an organic or a structural disorder find themselves faced with a serious problem of social adjustment; and in the second place, those who are socially maladjusted by causes other than organic or structural disorder manifest this maladjustment in their defect of voice in speech. It is with this second class of speech defectives that I am concerned in this paper. From the point of view expressed in the definition of speech as an instrument of social adaptation these functional speech defectives show inadequate adjustments on the part of human organisms to their social environment. Their disorder is merely a symptom of a lack of good social adjustment, or an indication of a social morbidity in the realm of the emotional, the affective, and the conative life.

For a number of years teachers have discussed the approach to the content of the first course in speech in our colleges and universities. Many departments have had "first course conferences" in attempts to discover ways and means of actually effecting changes, improvements, developments, or what not, in the individual student who goes through two quarters, five hours a week, of training.

I have been of the opinion that the point of view typical of such speech conferences, namely that of thorough training in the speech arts, has lead us nowhere. Drills for voice, relaxation exercises for body tensions, and training in the logical handling of the thought problem may have had some temporary effect—but I doubt that they have produced any permanent results. The type of handling that includes only the above methods has been an illusion built up as a necessary peg upon which to hang our hopes and aspirations; it is a makeshift analogous to the ancient concept of heaven—an excuse for ignorance and an escape from the realities of this world.

To face the problem of speech training from the angle, mental

hygiene, has been difficult because it necessarily begins with the study of self, and that is the hardest thing to study. Teachers have not enjoyed even the discussion of complexes, inhibitions, etc., in other maladjusted personalities because they themselves were experiencing similar problems and they resented the implied analysis of their own difficulties. Perhaps it was not to be expected that they would react in any other way. But, be that as it may, they, with their own problems of personality unapproached, and unsolved, could do very little for the student.

The attack, then, that I want to make on speech is that in the past, and, I dare say, in ninety-five per cent of the fundamental courses in speech now in existence, we have not got at the root of this problem of changes in the individual's adjustments in order that he may aim at control of and adaptation to his social environment by means of audible and visible symbols. In fact we have been dealing with symptoms rather than causes. The most common symptoms of underlying disturbances and of lack of emotional adjustment within and without are: shifty eye glance, twisting movements of body (facial and torsal), random movements, blushing, swallowing, inability to make a first talk in class, total breakdown on the automatic level (crying), etc.

The days of drill for disorders of a functional nature are almost past. The drill method was a sort of compensation for a deficiency, just as the concept of heaven was a compensation for an inadequate adjustment to the life here on earth.

The establishment of speech clinics in various colleges and universities in this country is a rather recent development. Here the students with speech difficulties are examined, analyzed, diagnosed, and treated.

Now the question arises, is it possible to extend this clinic system so that speech problems can be handled in the classroom? Assuming that the patients who are now being studied in the clinics do change their capacities for fellowship—can this be better effected in the classroom by extending the clinic procedure into the classroom?

It is such a method that the writer wishes to discuss here. The class is one in the fundamentals of speech. The study of personality is approached from the point of view of mental hygiene. Speech is defined as a means of adjusting to one's environment

and of exercising control over it. Having given a few opening lectures on human reactions, the instructor then holds the first speech conference to deal with the student's personal history. The members of the class learn to understand not only their own behavior, but also that of their classmates, when participating in a speech situation.

It is made clear to them that the speech arts as such, namely better voices, more relaxed bodies, motivated gestures, etc., can be mastered only by those who have first mastered their own emotional problem. Poise is considered a means, not an end. This subjective view of their speech problem habits becomes a common practice for students, both in the classroom and in the smaller groups of four or five that meet for practice periods twice a week.

The first speech exercises in the classroom are utilized for the purpose of detecting symptoms. There appear the usual ones that all of us at one time or another encounter in speech classes: shifting eye glances, blushing, random movements, harsh tense voices, muscle tensions in face, hands, etc., and general emotional behavior.

The procedure in private conference and in the classroom is as follows:

I. A recognition on the part of the student that there is something about his present adjustment that gives the auditor an unpleasant and a negative reaction.

II. A localizing of the difficulty. This involves the taking of a case history.

III. By the interpretation of these historical facts the student is shown that the present adjustment which he is making is not adequate to secure for him his own peace and happiness or that of his auditors. In other words, his capacity for fellowship has these various handicaps to contend with.

IV. The student is shown that a more positive and a more socially acceptable adjustment is possible. His speech problem becomes then one of substituting for his old method a new method of adjusting to a social speech situation.

It is interesting to note that seldom, if ever, is there a group of twenty-five speech students everyone of which does not present some problem of an emotional character. These problems range from overcompensations for feelings of inferiority to the lack of

control of temper. Always does one find a number who present "only child" problems which give the picture negativism, inferiority and dependence, and, in many cases, hysteria.

The functional disorders now being studied in the speech clinics always have the problem of social adjustment to conquer; it is the major part of their therapy. Now this classroom situation I have been talking about (I am assuming that these people are sent to the clinic by speech teachers who have them in their speech classes) offers them a general social situation. They are also under the direction of the person who has studied them in the clinic. They have a chance to verbalize their early experiences which have caused their present maladjustment. This not only vivifies their problem, but keeps them alert and observant of the progress other individuals are making.

Six months of this type of intensive training can bring about changes in the students' adjustments—and, on the basis of actual experience, I feel warranted in saying that personalities are actually changed from negative to positive ones.

I believe that I can make some of these points clearer by presenting some typical cases. Case 1 is a nineteen-year-old boy of good intelligence who has a bad voice. His behavior on the classroom platform at his first appearances gave undeniable evidence of a tense, rigid body and staring eye contact; his attitude was one of belligerence; his speech was bombastic; he considered the class as a "squad" in the army, in whose presence he waxed very oratorical—waving his arms profusely as he stampeded the herd. His first five talks were on military training.

After he had delivered his talk he would sink down in his chair. He began early to feel that the class adjusted negatively to him. The class knew that he would talk on militarism the moment his turn for a speech came.

His history revealed that his father was a captain in the army who began early teaching John a military technique in which drill was as sacred as the school or the church. When other boys were out playing he was learning to drill. Whenever John did manage to get away he made the most of his time by stealing, and later, at the age of eleven, he avoided reality by taking to drinking. He became tough in National Guard camps. He has always day-dreamed a great deal. He became interested in books; never-

theless, his father, when he learned that John was not going to be a doctor—this was the father's choice—refused to send him to college. In spite of the lack of support from home, John determined to go; he entered the university pre-legal course. He was able to find work sufficiently remunerative so that with his present wages and his savings during the summer months he got along well financially.

He had a very difficult time adjusting to the military methods used in the University; at the end of the quarter he became discouraged with his work and almost decided to leave. He thought that his failure in his subjects was due to a lack of intelligence.

John was discovered quite late in the quarter, and I presume that according to Hoyle he should have been failed in the first quarter of the speech course. He did not master a great deal of the text, and during the first weeks of the course he made very poor social adjustments in the class.

But let John speak for himself. I shall quote a part of his history and his interpretation of it as he wrote it.

"In the National Guard Camp I carried on with drinking. I feel that I have come to hate drilling because my father made me drill when my chums were doing other things more pleasant. My associates in the National Guard were, it seemed to me, from the families lowest in morals and intelligence. I lived with them six weeks every summer for several years. I adopted this bombastic manner in language and tough behavior. I never spoke to a bunch of boys without swearing, and I always spoke in a 'tough tone of voice.' Whenever I went with anyone else outside the camp I treated them as I would members of my squad. I got the idea that it made no difference what people thought of me. I came into this class swearing in the presence of ladies—I know I was making a big fool of myself, attracting attention in this way. My attitude on the platform was one of 'cursing' the class and the subject, which, as the class has told me, was one they always expected me to talk upon.

"Out of this course in speech I have been able to realize my precarious and yet foolish position; conferences and class criticism have helped me to see that my timidity was hidden behind this cloak of militarism which was undoubtedly caused by the strict training I received from my parents. My day-dreaming and drink-

ing was an escape; my desires had been thwarted, and hence reality as I wanted to face it became too difficult for me.

"My progress in school was hampered by my attitude, which became a part of me because of the dictatorship of my father; he evidently was sincere in his wishes for me, but unfortunately his wishes were not fitted for one like me. The attitude toward my classmates came from my experiences in the National Guard, but I can get nowhere with this kind of life.

"This is what I have started to do and hope to continue:

1. Substitute habits of meeting reality for day-dreaming.

2. Think more constructively for myself—I am glad I was given an intelligence test.

3. Realize that my rebellious attitude is but a compensation for my negativism and serves as a protection for my feeling of inadequacy.

4. My associations with others are giving me assurance of my ability to be understood as 'I really am.'

5. My closest friends are members of this class, and they tell me that I walk differently and that I don't hide down in my chair any more; I must confess that has been quite unconscious on my part. I have been conscious of the contacts I have made with professors. Those whom I avoided last year I now meet with a sense of equality, and I don't believe I bluff them by my military pout.

"In concluding this paper—I don't want anyone to feel because of what I say that I am putting 'salve on a sore.' I know that I am on the road to better adjustments because I have been helped to get at the root of my difficulty. My fellowship with folks has improved because I realized I couldn't get anywhere with my old habits. I can't get anywhere by sitting back, like a 'beaten pup'; I must assert myself morally, physically, and intellectually. I have yet a long way to go, particularly in feeling at ease with the opposite sex (this I can't go into now)."

Well, John came across very positively in his final speech. He used very few of the old oratorical, bombastic devices which he had used earlier in the course. The written class criticisms were favorable. In fact, John has begun a new technique for social control. It is possible, we can say, that his personality is changing.

The second case gives a history of the typical "Main Street"

orthodox preacher's son. He lived in the country, but went to school in the city. He was forced, because of poverty, to wear his oldest sister's high-heeled, high-topped button shoes. In the coldest weather he appeared in school dressed in his grandmother's coat, which was well ruffled and pleated in colonial fashion.

He came home on several occasions, sometimes not finishing the day, and told his parents he hated school, the teacher, and the children. He wouldn't return. His parents, however, insisted that he become educated, and thus they forced him to continue school. They made no further investigation into his adjustments. Harry began, apparently, to get on nicely; he did not complain to his parents any more, but his grades were very poor. His deportment grade was always "excellent"; one month the teacher had noted on the report card—"Harry sits very still and doesn't bother anyone; most of the time he is looking out of the window." He was really being graded on his day-dreaming. It never occurred to the teacher that Harry had a hard time meeting reality on the play-ground, and that the time he spent in looking out of the window was undoubtedly occupied in concocting schemes and techniques whereby he could gain the attention of the group away from his ridiculous and asocial dress. This he succeeded in doing —but how?

He became a proficient teller of wonderful tales for these city boys. His father was the owner of thousands of acres of good land; several times he had taken Harry on several trips to large cities,—such were the fictions he told his classmates. Harry soon had his classmates sitting at his feet, eating stolen candy out of his hand, and thrilling to his wonderful tales of imagination. So he succeeded in protecting himself from the ridicule and the beatings (for he was a small child) that the bullies on the play-ground were prone to give him.

Well, the story is a long one. He managed to get along in this superimposed, impersonal manner. During adolescence he was without a confidant in his emotional changes, and, as a result, he became a tremendous emotional problem to himself. In his moments of isolation, when he got tired of adjusting in this superficial way to the group, he became morbid; he even attempted suicide, being actually caught once at fifteen years of age in the

act of hanging a noose about his neck. He looked forward to the asylum as a final resting place.

He got through high school because his father was president of the school board. Later he spent six months in a theological school. His father was certain that one of his many sons was to be a preacher. Harry got disgusted and began to have doubts about his ability to tell folks about "the love and wrath of an anthropomorphic God"—as he puts it. He left the seminary and came to the University. He made his grades, but he cheated his way for the most part.

I needn't describe to you in detail the picture of Harry in a speech situation before a group of twenty-nine classmates, all of whom were strange to him at the beginning of the course. Swaggering, with his head high in the air, he flung open the classroom door and took the front seat. He deliverd his first speech with his top coat and gloves on, although it was a warm, damp rainy day. He displayed the confidence of a Napoleon marching into battle. In his first talk he snickered a time or two and winked his eye when he had said something clever. His first talk was on "altruism." He spent much time moralizing on the need of getting away from selfishness and getting the thrill of doing things for others. It was for the most part a projection of his own failings. He told the class that he had been a high school debater and orator, and that he had studied in a seminary. He said that he wanted to become more convincing in his manner of speaking, and that for this reason he had entered the course. This was a rationalization, of course. He was proud of his ancestry and gave us a beautiful picture of "overcompensation."

His problem was so urgent that he was called for the first conference. In the clinic he proved, of course, to be a serious case of inferiority and very unhappy at heart. But he became so thoroughly converted to the new point of view that he felt he owed the class an apology for his first performance. And he felt that if he could actually verbalize his difficulty to this group—which, as he understood it, was to play a very constructive part in the improvement of his speech problem—his success would be assured. This being an experiment, more or less, he was allowed to do it. It did work.

At the end of the term the criticisms from classmates were:

"Harry, you are much more worthwhile as your real self, as we see you now." "You are getting a hold of your speech problem. We see very little trace of that bold front." "You talked more sincerely and directly today." "Your humor is real wit—before you were always trying to be funny."

Harry did well in the individual tests, having an I. Q. of 115. In groups he had fallen down to below average intelligence. With his adolescent worries cleared up and with a new belief in his ability, which up to this time he hadn't been able to give a fair showing, he made fair progress. He improved his habits of study, and became less inclined to give way to the call of the crowd when they insisted that they wanted him because "he was the life of the party." He became very serious in his attempts at re-evaluating himself and recognizing what constitutes the most worthwhile opinion of the group.

Case Three is that of an eighteen-year-old girl named Olive, who presented a picture of a girl of eight or nine in her emotional reactions. Her first appearance before the class ended in tears. She had a tiny voice coming from a very tense body; the best description of her is the following—"like a little chick just breaking out of the shell." Her background and training I need only leave to your imagination.

The analysis revealed that the poor little girl just didn't know what this world was all about. Sheltered from birth by a neurotic but Christian mother, she struggled through high school, passed the entrance test for the University, and thus found her way into a speech class. She came into the course because she had been told her voice was weak and she thought the course would strengthen it.

This case was taken over by three of her classmates who were rather intelligent and well adjusted themselves. They saw to it that she met people. They invited her to parties. She learned to dance and to play bridge—two of the seemingly necessary acts for modern social adjustments.

Need I say that her introversion is losing its hold on her, that she is now facing the class more courageously, and that her voice, which was like her personality, is changing in proportion to her change in capacity for fellowship? The only objective proof of this is the testimony of the class and a dictaphone record made in the laboratory.

Now these cases handled in the old way, and, I dare say, by a great number of teachers in speech today, would be something like this:

John would be told—"You are too tense; you must relax. You must try not to antagnoize your audience. Work for more effusive utterance"—this would then be illustrated by the instructor himself in the reading of some stanza of poetry, solemn and reverent in mood.

And to Harry this same instructor would say: "You are too cocky and you irritate me by your snappy stories. You must never get on the platform with your coat and gloves on when you are speaking in a well-heated room. Your voice is too high pitched; get it down where it will be pleasant to listen to. Don't swagger in your walk, and, above all, you must not talk so rapidly." The instructor, however, might be attracted to Harry because of the fact that this student had debated in high school. The first conference with Harry then would probably sound this note: "If you could get out of your cocksure attitude and lower your pitch, I believe you would have ability as a speaker; you ought to major in speech; we are looking for men like you." "Well," says Harry, "how can I change my voice and attitude?" The instructor replies, "In the text you will find a chapter on *Pitch*, a very excellent one, and at the close of the chapter there are some exercises; practise those an hour each day, then come up and we shall make a dictaphone record and point out your improvement."

No one knows what might have been suggested to Olive. In my opinion this old method of handling these problems is futile, and I venture to say that in most instances it not only prolongs the duration of the existing deep-seated, unsatisfied emotional problem in the individual, but that it actually creates and nourishes greater ones.

In conclusion: I feel convinced that the corrective speech clinics have something to offer in the way of a technique of building up speech courses into a reputable situation for which students will register, not because it is a "pipe" course, but because they realize that here is an opportunity to get at the fundamental problems of facing life in a more sane, rational, and optimistic manner. If this approach which I have tried to suggest is made by teachers who are fairly well adjusted themselves and who have

an understanding of mental hygiene, with all its ramifications in human behavior,—then I believe that a student who has taken a fundamental course in speech and has acquired insight into and mastered the analytic technique should not only be ready for advanced speech courses, but should feel toward life a newness of courage and faith and an openness of mind which will result in the success and happiness that comes only from better social adjustments.

DEBATE OR POLITICS?

HENRY C. KLINGBEIL
Bay City Junior College

ALMOST ten years have passed now since a real American Indian held the position of athletic coach in a public school of Oklahoma. To say the least, he possessed all the tricks and cleverness of the Red Race. To all in this town he was known as Chief. Hardly ever did Chief lose a home game in football. In the first place he was called a schedule-maker, and he knew the great, American public too well to schedule a better team than his, on the home gridiron, unless a previously contracted return game compelled him to. In the second place the Chief's team had a reputation in the State of knowing every possible underhand trick in football. In the third place, on the home ground he hired his own referees. In this art he was almost unsurpassed, for he always (except in exceptional big games where the opposing coach insisted on neutral officials), hired the City editor of the local newspaper. This had three decided advantages,—namely: the city editor's income was supplemented; the Chief received a large amount of personal advertising; and the home team very seldom lost a game in its own back yard. *But this is athletics.*

At a public speaking conference in one of our leading Universities a Miss Guildenstern or a Mrs. Rosencrantz (I forget whether she was married or was to be married shortly) gave an interesting talk on the relation between scholarship and debate. At the end of one of her courses in the University she with the bland countenance of a peach smiling at a strawberry asked the learned profes-

sor if she was going to get an A. Her record of A's showed that she was very competent to talk on this subject.

Does debating in the high schools help the pupils to search for truth? Opponents say no. Instead of reasoning out the proposition pupils quote copious authorities, or juggle facts and statistics, or engage in a smooth speech with perfect delivery by means of memorized constructive and memorized rebuttal speeches. In the majority of cases the smooth presentation will attract the judge unskilled in debating. Therefore some coaches will pick the most attractive pupils, those who are blessed by nature with pleasant voices. Not long ago one coach almost won the state championship by this method, with three thoroughly memorized rebuttals which would meet the three possible plans of an opposing team. However, the pleasant delivery not only attracts the vote of the unskilled judges, but sometimes draws a vote from those who are teaching debate. I am thinking now of a one-time head of the public speaking department of one of the normal schools. This particular head, who wrote a book on debate, specialized in reading poetry beautifully. One evening after he had acted as sole judge in a debate, he advised the losing team to improve their open vowel sounds. Then he quoted a portion of one of Longfellow's poems to drive home his point. Unfortunately, though advising the losing team to gain their emphasis by improving their open vowel sounds, his illustration gained emphasis mainly by pause. Yet he declared that he had been attracted to the winning team, not because of any superiority of argument in either their constructive or rebuttal speeches, but because of the purity of their open vowel sounds.

Talk to the judges. My first college debate coach made this very plain. The "ladies and gentlemen" don't count. It's the three judges that have the power to feed the great American appetite for victory that count. In this particular instance there were two ministers in the list of three judges for our first debate. Our very capable coach who, by the way, was an ex-minister himself, proceeded to line up the speeches in order to satisfy two conditions—namely: to appeal to the clergymen's love for the moral side of a question, and to cause no offense to the preachers' ears by eliminating such doubtful terms as "Heavens" (used as a mild form of swearing.) *But this is scholarship.*

Selecting judges plays an important role in high-school debating. Recently three judges gave a two-to-one decision in a contest. Needless to say for their next debate this school invited two of the judges to return, but for the third judge, who had voted against that school in the previous debate—well, his invitation was lost in the mail.

Shortly after Mr. X was elected as County Superintendent, he was called upon to be a judge in a debate between a school outside his county and a school the superintendent of which had not supported Mr. X for County Superintendent. How did Mr. X vote? Returning home in the car I heard Mr. X's frank admission. He had supported the obviously weaker team. He said that Mr. Y had made a vigorous campaign against him, but that he, Mr. X, would show Mr. Y that he bore no grudge, and that accordingly he had voted for Mr. Y's team regardless of the merits of the case. Besides, no one really knows who wins a debate anyway. Furthermore, a new County Superintendent cannot invite unnecessary criticism by voting for a team from another county.

When high schools engage in a state-wide contest, the inevitable question of travel and expense towards the last because acute. At one time I was called to be the sole judge at a debate which was held away up in a one-train-a-day region, where the expense of visiting teams and of hiring judges was a serious consideration. The good Superintendent met me at the train, took me to the hotel in his car, and invited me to supper at his home. Everything was done to keep from ruffling the judge in any way. At 8 o'clock the victory-loving public had gathered to hear the home town win. Picture it to yourself, the judge has just been royally entertained, and well fed at the home of a man who now faces his patrons and bosses, who demand in this athletic age nothing short of a victory. Besides, when all expenses of the judge were added up, it amounted to fifty dollars. A one-man judge! A fifty dollar investment! A demanding public! A close debate! Both coaches would claim the decision anyway. There wasn't any visible touchdown, or home-run made. The visiting team with its coach and principal were not facing an audience that would be chagrined in case of a defeat. How did the judge vote? How would you have voted? Maybe I did too. *But this is politics.*

Two or three years ago an American University debating team appeared in England. I was anxious to get the English point of view. Here it is from the pen of a British University graduate:

> The American system of debating does not meet with overmuch approval in England. The American style with masses of prepared smart sayings and very little material to the point is not at all pleasing. The concensus of opinion indicates that the American debaters were found lacking in any depth of thought but that they tried to make up for this by spectacular methods which carried them no distance with an English audience.
>
> To understand why the English debate differs so radically in its nature from the American, one must realise that the function of the debate in the two countries is fundamentally different. In America the debate is primarily an entertainment for the audience, which must be amused; it must be fed with material that it can readily understand; its emotions must be played upon and it must be flattered. The debater who succeeds in doing this the best, is the star of the team, and the team that can do this consistently wins the reputation for being a good team, no matter how illogical their argument, no matter how little pith to their material, no matter how full of pompous nothings their speeches. So long as plenty of so-called authorities are quoted—or, more often, half quoted—the audience is satisfied that irrefutable arguments have been presented them, and they, not desiring, or not able to exert their brains to challenge what Professor A of the University of B had said, or Senator Y of Oshkosh has written, are deeply impressed. Judging from the number of so-called authorities I have heard quoted in a debate I am forced to conclude that American teams believe debate to consist more largely of reference to other people's opinions than the use of their own reasoning faculties.
>
> American debating tactics make an English audience impatient, because paradoxically speaking there is no audience in an English debate. Curiously enough, debating in England is in one way more democratic than in America, for every person in the debating room is a potential debater that evening.
>
> When the opening speeches of the debate have been given, and they are usually four in number instead of six, the debate is thrown open to the audience, when sometimes as many as twenty speakers make a contribution. Few are the fallacies in the opening speeches which remain unattacked under this system, and the the speaker who has relied mainly

upon effect rather than argument finds that his contribution to the debate is exactly nil.

In closing the debate the task of the two openers—one from either side who alone are allowed to speak twice—is somewhat different and is rather a summing up of the salient features of the arguments for his case than an actual rebuttal, for much of the open debate has consisted of rebuttal. The audience then, in parliamentary fashion, themselves vote upon the issue, though the practice in doing so is not governed usually by any underlying principle; some vote according to their convictions regarding the issue which was under debate, others vote more in accordance with the American fashion, balloting for the side which in their opinion has presented the best case.

Under this system, with a thoroughly critical audience keenly on the look-out for every hole in an argument, and ready to pounce upon it and expose it, more attention is paid to the essentials of debate—which after all is the argument—than to the trimmings, such as delivery and gesture. The English debate is essentially a spontaneous affair. In the universities and colleges it flourishes alone under the auspices of a student governed society; in the schools it is rarely taught other than incidentally in the English lesson, though some enterprising schools now have extra-curricular debating societies for senior scholars under the supervisions of one of the English teachers, who however, by no stretch of the imagination could be called a coach.

The greatest need of the American brand of debating to-day is some definite, visible scoring scheme. Million-dollar stadiums are built in order that the sport-loving public may see the actual points scored. Unfortunately, the brain action is invisible and safely hidden in thick boney skulls. Some one has said that the human mind and body are born lazy. Certainly one sees very little attempt at abstract reasoning. Many of the judges in local debates have not studied the proposition and hence they vote on appearance and delivery, or they cast a political vote.

For the present at least, there does not seem to be any hope for a tangible point-scoring scheme. Most of the coaches whom I have interviewed favor counting twice as much for the rebuttal speeches as for the constructive speeches. The reason for this is obvious. A team may memorize the coaches' ideas of an air-tight argument and present these ideas with a pleasant delivery, but when a team has to apply without any assistance from the coach

the answer to these arguments, that team has to do a little thinking of its own.

In order to make for a better state contest, I offer the following suggestions: The state should be divided up into districts and a series of preliminary debates should be held to determine the best team in each district. Judges should be chosen from the coaches in another district. The judges' expenses should be divided in half and the home team and the visiting team should each pay its share. As the gate receipts will not generally support the debate, the coach should ask for a budget from the school board. In case this is impossible I suggest that the drama, which almost always is a financial success should be made to contribute a certain percentage of, or even, if necessary, all its net receipts instead of financing a dance or a class gift to the school, when the debate needs its support.

After all that has been said to the contrary, debate has its values. Many a pupil has learned to think on his feet. In athletics the coach tries his best to think for his players, by means of running in substitutes, by trickery, and by outlining in forceable language between the halves the plan of attack for the second half; but in debate the coach must abandon the team and allow the members to meet the new situations unaided. This is a valuable training.

A RATING SCALE FOR PUBLIC SPEAKERS

WILMER E. STEVENS*
University of Wyoming

[The Editor is so prejudiced against rating scales and "scientific" tests for effective speaking that he has no faith in their value. This article is printed in the hope that it will call forth a general discussion.]

PRELIMINARY studies of the best twenty-five per cent. of a group of forty-two public speaking students indicate that the speaker who succeeds before a student audience is characterized

* The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. Richard S. Uhrbrock, Dr. June E. Downey, Mr. H. P. Constans, Mr. Wilson O. Clough, and Alice Hardie Stevens, members of the vocational guidance class of the University of Wyoming summer school of 1927, and students whose cooperation made this study possible.

by intimate relation to his audience, wide-awake appearance, easy movement, response to reactions of his audience, use of gesture, and fluency. A similar study of the poorest twenty-five per cent. indicates that the poorest speaker pays little or no attention to his audience, does not move easily, uses no humor at all, uses almost no gestures, shows little emotion, and is not forcefully sincere. Few of these findings are unexpected, but the important question is: How generally and to what extent are they true? If such generalizations as these are true, are there well-defined exceptions to them? If so, what is the nature of each exception? How are such questions as these to be answered with certainty?

The nature of public speaking ability is learned by studying and comparing good speakers, just as the nature of grammar is learned by studying and comparing good writers. Between the two processes, however, there is this difference: the writer leaves a complete record of his activity for comparison with the records of other writers; whereas the speaker, even when a stenographic report of his speech is made, leaves only a partial record of what he did. There is much more to a speech than the words uttered. Just what more there is is not easy to determine, inasmuch as speakers in a state of activity can not be put side by side and compared like prize specimens of live-stock. Neither can the human memory be trusted to keep an accurate record of a given speech. Hence, a really scientific comparison of speeches is not possible at present. The rating scale presented in this article is offered as a start toward more accurate recording of some of the more intangible aspects of public speeches, the conduct of the speaker, specific reactions of the audience, and so on.

MEASURE OF SUCCESS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING

A clear concept of the meaning of the term *public speaking* is necessary to an understanding of this rating scale. As generally used, the term covers almost any kind of appearance before an audience. It is very common practice in the colleges and universities throughout this country to include dramatics, interpretative reading, etc., in the Department of Public Speaking, or, more properly, the Department of Speech. As the term is used by authorities in the field, however, *public speaking* properly includes only *self*-expression before an audience. Conversely, interpretation—drama, elocution, reading—may not accurately be called public

speaking. A public speaking course, then, aims to train individuals to successfully communicate an adequate expression of themselves, their own feelings and ideas, to an audience through the spoken word as the principal medium.

The measure of success in public speaking as defined above is the degree in which the self-expression is adequate and the communication complete and accurate. In any investigation of the characteristics of good public speaking we must endeavor to employ objective standards of success whenever possible. As the idea is put by some authorities, a speech is successful to the degree in which the speaker accomplishes his purpose. A very common and easily comprehended example is afforded by the salesman. The salesman is essentially a public speaker, though his activities are usually conducted upon a scale considerably reduced from what we usually think of in this connection. It is his purpose to give expression to the desire that the prospect buy the goods he is selling and to communicate that desire to the prospect to such a degree that it becomes a motivating force. The cumulative success of the salesman's talks is easily measured in terms of his income.

Though it is not so easily measured elsewhere, success in public speaking generally is determined by the same standards as it is in the more limited field of salesmanship. It is perfectly clear that the chapel speaker who sets out to inspire the youth before him with high ideals and succeeds only in amusing them for an hour, fails as certainly as did the old-fashioned drummer who was an invariable source of entertainment to the staff of the local grocery but who seldom took an order.

A NEW RATING SCALE FOR PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Oddly enough, most of the study of successful speakers to date has been observational, dependent upon the notoriously fallible human memory for its accuracy. With the exception of studies of certain phases of voice quality made by Woolbert[1] and Weaver[2], the writer knows of no attempts having been made to subject the activity of public speaking to scientific, statistical examination. The scientific method has been adopted with great effectiveness in

[1] WOOLBERT, C. H.—"Effects of Various Modes of Public Speaking," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1920, Vol. 4, pp. 162-185.

[2] WEAVER, A. T.—"Experimental Studies in Vocal Expression," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1924, Vol. 8, pp. 23-51.

the study of general psychic phenomena during the past few years. Ability to speak in public has been generally recognized as an important factor in success in life. Yet, those who have undertaken the task of developing skill along this line in the rising generations are still dependent upon the observational studies of a few authorities for the facts upon which they base their instruction. These studies have been exceedingly valuable, and many of the broad generalizations laid down by the authorities are undoubtedly sound. Nevertheless, the discovery of the relationship between these principles and of the nature of important exceptions to them will require more detailed investigation than is possible to make by means of the empirical method. Such investigation will undoubtedly clear up much of the vagueness and many of the seeming anomalies that sometimes puzzle the user of the current texts.

The function of the rating scale which has been devised is to serve as a definite and, in some degree at least, fixed standard against which speakers and audiences may be measured. Of course, any rating scale, based as it must be upon opinion, falls considerably short of the concreteness and accuracy of objective measurement. This defect, however, is not so serious in a scale to be used in the field of public speaking as it might be elsewhere. Success in speaking is determined by the combined effect of many opinions. Furthermore, the concrete expression of opinion which can be obtained by the use of the scale will be of value for comparison with other more objective measures. The evaluation and classification of opinion would in itself be a service of immense value to prospective speakers.

The rating scale technique is now so generally used that a brief description of the construction of this scale will suffice. To begin with, fifteen characteristics of speakers were selected. Characteristics were chosen which in the experience of the writer and the opinion of such recognized authorities on pubic speaking as Dolman,[3] Houghton,[4] West,[5] Winans,[6] Woolbert,[7] are most likely

[3] DOLMAN, JOHN, JR.—*A Handbook of Public Speaking*, 1922, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York.

[4] HOUGHTON, H. G.—*Elements of Public Speaking*, 1916, Ginn & Co.

[5] WEST, R. W.—*Purposive Speaking*, 1924, Macmillan Co., New York.

[6] WINANS, J. A.—*Public Speaking*, 1916, Century Co., New York.

[7] WOOLBERT, C. H.—*Fundamentals of Speech*, 1927, Harper & Bros., New York.

to be determiners of success. Definability was also taken into consideration in making this selection. An effort was made to include only those traits which could be defined with sufficient positiveness to insure a fair degree of consistency between ratings by different individuals. Thus, "personality" has been purposely omitted from this scale. While the thing to which we refer by that name is undoubtedly one of the most significant factors in the success of a speaker, it is difficult to define except as a blend of many traits. Opinions as to what it really is vary so widely as to render ratings upon it of little value for statistical treatment. After the traits which have been included had been selected, five phrases were framed to describe types possessing each trait in degrees varying by approximately equal amounts from the minimum to the maximum. The whole was then combined in the complete form presented herewith.

Experience with the scale so far indicates that a linear arrangement of the descriptive terms to permit interchecking by the rater may be desirable. In the partial alternative form of the scale included in this article to illustrate the arrangement just described the names of the traits have been omitted. At least one writer[8] upon rating scales believes the rater is less likely to read the definition of a trait when its name is on the scale. This change, of course, could easily be made in the mimeographed form.

That the scale does furnish a fairly uniform standard for comparison of speakers is indicated by the results of its use at the University of Wyoming to date. Forty-two public speaking students in classes of from four to ten members were rated on the scale by their instructors on the basis of their final examination speeches. The various descriptive terms for each trait were weighted by having five people[9] rank them from one to five in the order of their desirability as qualities of a speaker. From the weights thus obtained the ratings were scored. At the same time that the students were being rated by the instructors on the scale

[8] SCOTT, W. D., AND CLOTHIER, R. C.—*Personnel Management*, A. W. Shaw Co., Chicago, 1923, p. 216.

[9] These included two instructors in public speaking, a professor of English, a professor of psychology, all men, and one woman, local branch president of A. A. U. W. and a former four-year debater and instructor in English.

they were ranked in order of merit by their fellows. The average order of merit ranking of the students as given by themselves was then compared with the ranking given them by the rating scale score. Coefficients of correlation were computed (Spearman Rank Method) between the student ranking and the scale ranking within each class, giving the following results: $+.47 \pm .16$; $-.20 \pm .32$; $+.73 \pm .10$; $\pm .60 \pm .19$; $+.21 \pm .24$; $+1.00 \pm .00$. As will be seen, the small numbers in some of the classes made the P. E. so large that the correlations are not significant. In order to get a more dependable index, the student rankings for the entire group of forty-two were then combined by the method described by Ream[10] and this ranking compared with the ranking of the group on the basis of rating scale scores. The coefficient of correlation obtained was $+.654 \pm .06$.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

What little work has been done so far with this scale indicates two things rather definitely. Using the scale to get ratings of the same speaker by different individuals has shown that the traits included have been described exactly enough to bring about a rather high degree of agreement among raters. The comparison of a ranking of speakers from scale ratings with a ranking of the same speakers by their audiences has revealed a close agreement between the two rankings.

The studies which have been made are limited. The writer wishes to call attention to some of the things which may be done with this scale. The descriptive terms under each trait need to be weighted rather accurately. The traits themselves need to be weighted in proportion to their importance in determining the success of a speaker with various types of audiences. It may be found that the rating pattern is more significant than a total score based upon the weighting of descriptive phrases within the traits. Thus, it may be that a speaker with an "Abraham Lincoln Type" physique achieves more success using "simple, homely" language than with any other kind. Ratings should be obtained upon many successful speakers—men and women who accomplish the result at which they aim, be it to entertain, to raise money, to sell goods, to gain votes, or what-not. With such ratings should be kept an ac-

[10] MERRILL J. REAM—"A Method for Combining Incomplete Ratings," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1921, Vol. 5, p. 261.

curate and detailed description of the audience and a record of the speaker's purpose and the evidence of success.

It should also be noted that the scale may be used in two ways. Placed in the hands of experienced raters who are capable of adopting an objective and analytical attitude, it will aid in getting a concrete and accurate description of the speaker. Placed in the hands of all members, or of a scattered group of unselected members, of an audience, it will serve to preserve a record of the judgment of the audience for comparison with such purely objective records of the speech as might be obtained through a stenographic report, a phonographic recording, or a moving picture.

Finally, it must be remembered that the rating scale method of keeping a record of a speech for analysis should be used only until other and better methods can be brought into operation. The perfection of the Vitaphone has made available an almost ideal means for the study and teaching of public speaking. It will be a matter of a few years at most until some progressive institution will be making "vitaphonic" records of famous speeches to serve as models for aspiring orators. The public speaking student of the future will learn what his faults are by sitting in the audience and watching himself and listening to himself speak. Meanwhile we can blend our efforts to stimulating interest in the investigation of an activity which has infinite possibilities for bringing about co-operation or discord among men.

RATING SCALE FOR PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Name_____Male ( ) Female ( )
School_____ Date_____

READ THESE DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY: Success in public speaking depends upon a combination of personal characteristics. Below are listed fifteen characteristics which are thought to be related to success in speaking. You are asked to read the names of these characteristics and their definitions. Then read the descriptive terms that follow. Put a cross (X) in the parenthesis before the words or phrases that best describe the individual under consideration. For example, if the "Physique" of the person being rated impresses you as being "poorly proportioned and ill-nourished," put a cross before that phrase. Consider each descriptive term separately. If no term for a particular trait describes the speaker exactly, check the one that *most nearly* describes him. *Check one descriptive term for each trait.*

1. PHYSIQUE: Consider the individual as a physical object Notice size of head, width of shoulders, trunk, and limbs.	( )	Poorly proportioned and ill-nourished
	( )	Strong but loose-jointed
	( )	Well proportioned and well knit
	( )	"Abraham Lincoln type"
	( )	Powerful, commanding, forceful

2. VOICE: Consider the *sound* qualities of the individual's voice. Enunciation, pronunciation, use of language should *not* be considered.	( )	Agreeable, strong
	( )	Irritating, weak, harsh
	( )	Light but pleasant
	( )	Resonant, powerful, pleasing
	( )	Rich and vibrant but high
3. RELATION TO AUDIENCE: Consider the attitude of the speaker toward his audience.	( )	Detached; talks to himself
	( )	Interested, rather superior, paternal
	( )	Friendly, but reserved
	( )	Antagonistic, belligerent, contemptuous
	( )	Intimate, confidential
4. UTTERANCE: Consider the ease and certainty with which you are able to hear and understand what the speaker is saying.	( )	Fair—no outstanding characteristic
	( )	Words unmistakable, incisive, clear
	( )	Careless in pronunciation
	( )	Jaws too close together—vowels shut in
	( )	Slurs sounds—consonants not sharp
5. FACIAL EXPRESSION: Consider your impression of the speaker's nature as reflected in his countenance.	( )	Supercilious
	( )	Affable, placid
	( )	Blank, stupid
	( )	Alert, designing
	( )	Wide awake, friendly
6. MOBILITY: Consider the speaker's general physical reaction to the situation of talking before an audience, the amount and spontaneity of movement.	( )	Movement mechanical or nervous
	( )	Stands as though rooted
	( )	Movement increases effectiveness
	( )	Paces like caged tiger
	( )	Movement easy, not well timed
7. HUMOR: Consider the nature and quality of the humor used by the speaker and his method of introducing it.	( )	No humor at all
	( )	Forced flippancy
	( )	Humor original, attractive
	( )	Speech mostly anecdotes
	( )	Few stories well used
8. RESPONSIVENESS: Consider the readiness with which the speaker notices reactions of the listeners and adapts his procedure to them.	( )	Takes account of strong or general reactions
	( )	Answers thots of listeners before fully formed
	( )	Makes no adjustment to audience
	( )	Sensitive to audience but adapts slowly
	( )	Stimulated by signs of approval

9. GESTURE: Consider the manner in which the speaker uses his hands and upper body in reinforcing his speech.	( )	Gestures unconstrained but awkward
	( )	Gestures conspicuously absent
	( )	Gestures wild, distracting
	( )	Gestures inhibited or listless
	( )	Gestures graceful, natural, appropriate
10. EMOTION: Consider the speaker's apparent emotional reaction to his speech.	( )	Cold, unmoved, hardboiled
	( )	Controlled but not constrained
	( )	Sentimental, sloppy, saccharine
	( )	Inflates meagre emotional capital
	( )	Simulates, masks emotions
11. LOGIC: Consider the clarity and soundness of the speaker's reasoning.	( )	Is careless but shows penetration and power
	( )	Has a mind like a waste-basket
	( )	Reasons soundly but rather obviously
	( )	Thinks soundly, subtly, originally
	( )	Shows flashes of discernment
12. SCOPE OF VISION: Consider whether or not the ideas expressed are of limited or of far-reaching significance.	( )	Theme of superior breadth and depth
	( )	"Very worth-while talk"
	( )	Speaker can't see beyond his own nose
	( )	Covers wide field, not exhaustively
	( )	Goes deeply into limited subject
13. FLUENCY: Consider the flow of the speaker's words. Notice tendency to block, repeat, stutter, or to say "Ah."	( )	Very deliberate, words carefully selected
	( )	Slow, jerky, hesitant
	( )	Steady, unhurried
	( )	Too smooth, sounds memorized
	( )	Words tumble over each other
14. DICTION: Consider the general character of the language used by the speaker.	( )	Uses good newspaper English
	( )	Language simple, homely
	( )	Slangy, crude, illiterate
	( )	Uses words very exactly
	( )	Uses unnecessarily large words
15. SINCERITY: Consider the fidelity with which the speech reflects the individual behind it.	( )	Entirely but not forcefully sincere
	( )	Well dramatized
	( )	"The speech is the speaker"
	( )	Speaker earnestly desires to "get by"
	( )	Obviously a sham.

RATING SCALE FOR PUBLIC SPEAKERS
(Alternative form)

Name_____Male ( ) Female ( )

School_____ Date_____

READ THESE DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY: Success in public speaking depends upon a combination of personal characteristics. Below are listed fifteen characteristics which are thought to be related to success in speaking. You are asked to read the definitions of these characteristics. Then read the descriptive terms that follow. Put a cross (X) on the line at the point where you think the speaker being rated would fall. For example, if the physique of the person being rated impresses you as being "poorly proportioned and ill-nourished," put a cross on the line just above that phrase. If it seems to you that the best description of the speaker would fall at some point between two descriptive terms, put your cross on the line at that point. *Put a cross on the line under each trait at the point where it seems to you the speaker would be best described.*

1. Consider the individual as a physical object. Notice size of head, width of shoulders, trunk, and limbs.

Poorly proportioned and ill-nourished	Strong but loose-jointed	Well proportioned and well knit	"Abraham Lincoln type"	Powerful commanding forceful

2. Consider the *sound* qualities of the individual's voice. Enunciation, pronunciation, use of language should *not* be considered.

Resonant, powerful, pleasing	Rich and vibrant but high	Agreeable strong	Light but pleasant	Irritating Weak Harsh

3. Consider the attitude of the speaker toward his audience.

Antagonistic Belligerent Contemptuous	Detached; talks to himself	Friendly but reserved	Interested, rather superior, paternal	Intimate, confidential

4. Consider the ease and certainty with which you are able to hear and understand what the speaker is saying.

Slurs sounds Consonants not sharp	Jaws too close together-- Vowels shut in	Fair—no outstanding characteristic	Careless in pronunciation	Words unmistakable, incisive, clear

THE CONVERSATIONAL BASIS OF PUBLIC ADDRESS

FLOYD K. RILEY
University of California at Los Angeles

INASMUCH as teachers of speech are agreed that conversation must be the norm for public speech, it seems platitudinous to deal further with the subject of conversational delivery. A casual survey of any average lot of speakers is sufficient to demonstrate the need for such norm. One does not have to listen long to the dull monotonous tones of the novice, the sing-song melody of the spell-binder, the sanctimonious tones of the old-fashioned minister, the high-sounding meaningless phrases of the patriotic orator, the colorless academic delivery of the classroom lecturer, or the unthinking absent-minded manner of the memorizer, without his soul yearning within him for a breath of fresh oxygenized conversational speaking.

Although at this point all are seemingly agreed, any attempt to define conversational speaking destroys harmony. Each instructor desires to qualify the term. The speaker is urged to base his delivery upon "polite" conversation, or "parlor" conversation, or "dignified," or "ideal," or "elegant" conversation. Emphasis is laid upon that twilight zone in which private and public speech merge, and the student-speaker is warned against the numerous pitfalls of common speech. Ordinary conversation is taboo. The fact is neglected that if conversation possesses an element that is essential to public address, it should be an element that is common to all conversation,—the average student is somewhat ill at ease during "dignified" conversation.

The obscurity that arises from a discussion of this subject is often due to a lack of technical terms. Because of this, many writers on the subject find it difficult to specify the exact qualities which they have in mind, and frequently resort to the expediency of defining the term negatively,—that is, what it is not. A clear-cut definition that will be generally acceptable may be impossible of achievement, due to the fact that instructors and writers are not agreed upon the qualities that comprise such delivery. It is possible that the terms are being used inclusively rather than definitively.

A brief survey of the field discloses considerable variation in the terms used by modern writers who deal with this subject. For example, Houghton[1] uses the general expression "conversational delivery," as well as the expression "mode of conversation." Woolbert[2] uses the term "conversational mode," and occasionally speaks of "conversational manner." O'Neill and Weaver[3] speak of a "specific quality or characteristic," although their usual term is "conversational mode." Caplan[4] also uses the general term "conversational delivery." West[5] speaks only of "conversation." Thorpe[6] uses the term "conversational quality." Wagner[7] discusses "conversational quality" and is quite pointed about the fact that he does not mean "conversational manner, style, mode, or mood." Flemming[8] uses are terms "quality," "mode," and "manner" rather indiscriminately. Winans[9] consistently uses the expression "conversational quality" and distinguishes it quite carefully from "conversational style."

Definitions of the terms used are somewhat infrequent. Woolbert says,

> The kind of speech that most listeners understand with the least exertion is spontaneous, free from display, and unconstrained. It is this element of ease, of genuineness, of naïveté that constitutes the quality we call the conversational mode.[10]

O'Neill and Weaver state,

> The most illuminating word to use in connection with conversational speaking or the conversational mode is the word "directness." Conversational speaking is direct. It seems to be aimed at the particular persons to whom the speaker is

[1] HOUGHTON, HARRY GARFIELD, *The Elements of Public Speaking.*

[2] WOOLBERT, CHARLES HENRY, *The Fundamentals of Speech.* Rev. ed.

[3] O'NEILL AND WEAVER, *The Elements of Speech.*

[4] CAPLAN, HARRY, "Communication the Basic Principle." In Drummond, ed., *Speech Training and Public Speaking.*

[5] WEST, ROBERT, *Purposive Speaking.*

[6] THORPE, CLARENCE D., "The Course in Public Speaking." In Drummond, *Op. Cit.*

[7] WAGNER, RUSSEL H., "Conversational Quality in Delivery." In Drummond, *Op. Cit.*

[8] FLEMING, EDWIN G., "A Lively Sense of Communication." In Drummond, *Op. Cit.*

[9] WINANS, JAMES ALBERT, *Public Speaking.*

[10] WOOLBERT, *Op. Cit.*, p. 21.

speaking. It has the life, the inflection, the meaning of intimate, purposeful conversation.[11]

Winans analyzes the conversational quality as

(1) A full realization of the content of your words as you utter them;

(2) A lively sense of communication.[12]

He suggests to us that these are concerned with the creation or recreation of thought at the moment of delivery, and with directness of delivery.

In discussing the question of conversational delivery with instructors it appears that several ideas are current in public speaking circles. The first is that which is sometimes represented by the term *manner* or *style* of conversation. This idea seems to include numerous factors, such as, an easy careless posture characterized by leaning lightly upon desk or table, etc., subdued, well-modulated tones of voice, vernacular terminology marked by a "let-down" in the dignity of expression, and a certain freedom characterized by a rather friendly and chummy approach to the audience. The distinctive feature of this attitude seems to be its utter lack of formality and dignity. It is an attempt to get away from the stilted posture and phraseology of the "fathers." In this it is to be commended.

But some time ago I had the "pleasure" of listening to a winning oration repeated after it had won high honors. On this occasion the young man began by making a few prefatory remarks concerning his oration, in a very subdued tone of voice and in an easy informal manner. Many of his listeners did not distinguish the actual beginning of the formal address. This was good. But the delivery was marked throughout by such an affected and artificial informality as to destroy my enjoyment of it. It was a studied carelessness. I was afterward informed—by one who knew—that it was conversational delivery at its highest. To me it was a feigned imitation of a crude sort.

This danger has been recognized by several writers. O'Neill and Weaver make the distinction clear by saying,

> It is impossible to speak to twelve thousand people adequately and use the same voice, the same language, or the same action, which would be adequate in presenting the same ma-

[11] O'Neill and Weaver, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 345-346.

[12] Winans, *Op. Cit.*, p. 31.

terial to one or two people in private conversation. In public speaking, therefore, vocalization, language, and action vary as much as is demanded by the exigencies of the occasion on which we are speaking.[13]

That the exigencies of the occasion must determine the manner that is used on the public platform is shown also by Houghton,

> The conditions of public speech are usually more conventional than those of private conversation. The mere fact that the public speaker generally addresses a larger number, in a larger room, and at a fixed time and place, tends to make it so. Under these conditions he would not be likely to express himself in the same informal manner with which he would address a friend at his own fireside. His diction would probably be less colloquial, his manner more dignified, and his whole mode of delivery that befitting the public occasion. . . .
>
> There seems to be a misconception with nearly every student of public speaking that by conversational delivery is meant a mode of delivery that is entirely colloquial, that is informal. This is by no means the case. Speaking that is formal may be as truly conversational as that which is wholly informal. All depends, as we have seen, upon the occasion and the circumstance.[14]

Woolbert, too, takes a similar stand,

> The quality "directness" is not appropriate to all speaking in the sense of colloquial, easy, unstrained, informal, unadorned talk. Large occasions and urgent issues set the speaker apart from his hearers, above them, on a higher level. At such times colloquial ease can be the one manner most inappropriate. Informality can at times invite failure.[15]

Winans follows somewhat the same trend,

> . . . Do not suppose when you are urged to be conversational in pubic speech that you are expected to be less careful, or dignified, or strong, or eloquent than you would be otherwise. . . . .
>
> . . . Do not understand that I am advocating what is sometimes called "the conversational style." I advocate no style. The word suggests all to strongly that all should speak in one manner, while we should stand for individuality. I urge only that our public speaking should be conversational in its elements, and that each should develop and improve

[13] O'NEILL AND WEAVER, *Op. cit.*, p. 346.
[14] HOUGHTON, *Op. cit.*, pp. 45, 46.
[15] WOOLBERT, *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

> his own best conversation. It is not conversational style but conversational quality that we want in our platform delivery.[16]

Here is an attempt to distinguish between conversational *style* and *quality*. But inasmuch as the factor of informality does not seem to be an inherent element of all conversation, I do not see that the issue need to be complicated by applying the term "conversational" to it at all. Yet it has its place in the teaching of public speaking, and I suggest that it might be technically designated as the *approach* or the *intimate approach* of the speaker to his audience.

A second idea concerning the conversational norm in public speaking has to do with the vocal inflections of conversation. It is not concerned with matters of posture, physical expression, language, or subject matter, but only with voice nuances. It allows for any degree of intensity, any degree of volume, or pitch, or rate, so long as the speaker maintained the tone color of conversation. It must have the "life, the inflection, the meaning of intimate, purposeful conversation." This is without doubt an important factor in the study of the conversational norm, and deserves more extended treatment than is here given. It allows for any gradation of shading from the quiet tones of deliberative counsel to the rapid animated accents of excitement or anger. It is fundamentally opposed to intonation of every sort, and strikes at the root of such defects as the sing-song melody of the chanter, the nasal twang of the street spieler, or the sepulchral tones of the rapidly passing backwoods preacher. It is an attempt to awake the unmindful soliloquizer, and to recall to conscious attention the speaker who is "thinking back into his head." Merely to remind such a speaker that he should "speak naturally" is not sufficient, for the failing may have become so firmly entrenched through years of habitual use that it is no longer possible for the speaker to recognize such personal defects as sustained pitch, faulty emphasis, dearth of tone color, etc. It thus becomes necessary for him to learn new speech habits. He must form an entirely new set of mental and vocal associations with the public platform. This is not an easy task, and in extreme cases may be accomplished only through a retraining of the concept of tone recognition; he must acquire new mental habits, and from these he must form new tone habits. It requires time and effort but the results in every case

[16] WINANS, *Op. cit.*, pp. 25-28.

fully justify the painstaking effort necessary to produce the change.

This idea clearly concerns itself with all conversation and might technically be designated as the *voice patterns of conversation.*

It may be that we have erred slightly by trying to mold public address into the forms of conversation, that is, we have tried to make it sound like conversation. The difficulty encountered here is that conversation has so many varied sounds that we have no definite norm. It has been suggested that conversation and public speech display more differences than similarities. Professor West has made a splendid analysis of these dis-similarities:

> As compared with ideal conversation public speaking is usually more vivid in its imagery, more elaborate in its figures of speech, and more copious in its illustrations; it is usually more conventional in its language and delivery, expressed with more dignity, and exalted to a loftier plane of art; it is usually more definite in its statements, more accurate in its diction, and more coherent in its structure; it is usually delivered with more volume, enunciated more clearly, and spoken more fluently; it usually possesses a greater variety of quality, force, time, and pitch of the voice, that is, the inflections, modulations, nuances, and rhythms of the voice are more marked; it is usually accompanied by a more positive posture, more animated facial expression, and more profound gestures and movements. In short, it is at once more restricted by the formality of the occasion and more stimulated by the difficulties of the situation.[19]

Yet, as stated before, all are agreed that conversation contains an element that is essential to public speech. This element should be one that is common to all conversation and not restricted to a hypothetical ideal conversation engaged in by an extraordinary conversationalist. It must be a property of ordinary as well as dignified conversation.

With the aim of segregating such an element, it may be well to reconsider conversation at large. In any such study, several principles immediately clamor for attention:

(a) The conversation must be participated in by more than one person.

[19] WEST, *Op. cit.*, pp. 3, 4.

An individual *may* talk to himself. It may pass for an excellent soliloquy, but it is never noteworthy as a conversation,— an important part of the discussion is missing.

(b) The conversation is marked throughout by a conscious interest on the part of all concerned.
In any discussion, let one person become engrossed in a book and he is no longer considered a member of the discussion group.

(c) Conversation is a *give and take* proposition.
Each person contributes something to the discussion. Occasionally a conversation of the monologue type may occur, but even then the second party at times makes a definite response of assent, or otherwise, showing clearly that he has not "tuned out" of the conversation.

(d) Each party not only contributes to the conversation but each endeavors to meet the thought of the other *on the same plane.* In other words, every conversation is marked by a mental contest in which each person not only follows the thought of the other, but endeavors to answer with a thought of equal value and importance. This mental struggle to "keep even" is one of the salient features of every conversation.

These seem to constitute the essence or property of conversation.

Now, taking this analysis of conversation and applying the principles to public address, there appear to be certain properties common to conversation at large that are desirable to be incorporated into public speech. These may be thought of as follows:

1. A community of interest on the part of both speaker and listener in the thought content as it is presented.
2. Directness in the transmission of thought content from speaker to listener.
3. Mutual interchange of responses between speaker and listener.

These properties of conversation, inasmuch as they constitute the underlying qualities of conversation at large, both ordinary and dignified, might technically be referred to as the *conversational basis* of public address.

In considering these properties individually, it is a truism that conversations lag and speeches fail through a lack of community of interest in the phase of the subject under discussion. It would seem that the speaker could scarcely be held accountable for the lack of interest on the part of his hearers. Yet it is true that lack of interest and attention is probably due (a) to the inability of the speaker to comprehend the field of interest of his audience; or

(b) the speaker may utterly disregard that field of interest. The speaker becomes what Overstreet calls an "unloader,"—scholarly unloaders, scientific unloaders, family-trouble unloaders, etc.[20] The result is tragic. People gather together on most speech occasions becausse they desire to listen. Given a fair opportunity they will listen, providing the occasion is not carried beyond the pale of their natural or aroused interest by the speaker himself. Probably the requirements of eloquence are satisfied both in conversation and public address when, through deepened interest, speaker and audience are conscious of nothing but the thought content as it is uttered. But lack of community of interest invites failure.

Directness of thought transmission is important. It is a matter of speaking *to* or *with* the listener instead of at him or merely in his presence. He must be made to feel that he is on the receiving end of the speech, that he is recognized by the speaker as a part of the "conversation." Any kind of *detached* speaking voice will be unacceptable. The speaker's tones will possess those inflections that show him to have the full mental concept of the thought which he is presenting. His eyes will convey the impression of directness by becoming vehicles for the transmission of meanings. Everything about the speech will demonstrate to his listeners that they are directly connected with it. It is for *their* enjoyment, or *their* edification, or to change *their* beliefs and opinions. It is always for them. They are not bystanders and onlookers. They are participators in the address. It is distinctly a partnership proposition.

The third property or element of conversation grows out of the other two and is perhaps the most important of all. This is the mutual interchange of responses between speaker and listener. It is the unmentioned, usually unrecognized, yet ever-present mental contest between conversers. It is the endeavor of every member of a conversation to make his responses appropriate to the contributions of the other members of the conversation. Without this element a conversation loses all semblance of a discussion, and becomes merely a disconnected series of unrelated statements. The human mind is a questioning and contributing organism, yet a speaker will often attempt to converse with an audience without being aware of any response on the part of his

[20] OVERSTREET, H. A., *Influencing Human Behavior*, p. 73.

hearers. If someone should arise to ask for further information the speaker would be sufficiently courteous to explain until the questioner should be satisfied. But the audience can send to the speaker all sort of manifest silent responses without receiving the courtesy of any notice at all. The listener may not have understood the terminology, he may need further explanation of the idea presented, he may require additional evidence before being convinced, or he may desire other favorable and enjoyable matter of the same type as presented, but all to an unheeding speaker. The speaker is not on the receiving end of the line. Such a speech does not even rise to the level of a "monologue" conversation. In so far as communication is concerned, but one party is present. It is not conversational. There is no mental contest, no intellectual struggle, no mutual interchange of responses. Instead it bears the imprint of rubber-stamp production. It lacks the adjustment that brings it into contact with the needs and demands of the particular audience to which it is being delivered.

Thus it may be seen that there are several current ideas concerning conversational delivery that need to be distinguished in our teaching. One instructor may desire to emphasize one phase, while another instructor may desire to emphasize an entirely different phase, but let us not confuse them by applying to all of them some general non-definitive term such as "conversational delivery."

I listened recently to an address that well exemplified each of the elements discussed in this paper. It was delivered by President Glenn Frank of the University of Wisconsin to an audience of visiting editors and townsmen. The beginning of his address was characterized by a very *intimate approach* to his audience. It was informal, chummy, even confidential. It displayed easily the natural *voice patterns of conversation.* But as he proceeded to discuss the defects of society and to present remedies to be applied, his manner lost its easy informal character. He became the general leading his forces to battle. His voice gradually took on the ringing tones of the prophet who had come with a vital message. Only at the very beginning did his speech sound like conversation, yet at no time did he lose the element of community of interest, of directness of thought transmission, of mind to mind contact and response that constitutes the *conversational basis of pub-*

lic address. Not every speech needs to contain each of those elements in order to rank as a good speech, but this particular address did contain all of them, and was effective throughout.

No attempt has been made in this paper to be dogmatic. The idea has been to present a closer analysis of "conversation at large," and to offer such suggested terminology as shall aid in clarifying current thought upon the subject of the conversational basis of public address.

AFTER THIRTEEN YEARS*

J. M. O'NEILL
University of Michigan

SOME time this fall our President wrote me asking me to discuss this morning the reasons for the founding of our Association and to answer the question whether or not the Association is doing what it was planned to do. The principal part of President Weaver's request is contained in the following passage:

"What did the founders of the National Association look forward to? Why did they start the organization? Are we doing what you then thought we should do? etc. etc. Except for a very small handful who will be present at the convention, most of the members are in complete ignorance of how the Association came into existence, and how it has come to its present stature and influence."

After some consideration I accepted this appointment, and I am here this morning to tell you what I can of the reasons for which this Association came into being and to give you some basis for answering the question yourselves to what extent is this Association functioning as its founders supposed that it would function. In order to lend accuracy and authority to my statements here today I wrote to all of the founders or charter members of this Association who are still actively engaged in education and asked them to write me something to assist me in answering these questions which President Weaver has asked.

The men to whom I wrote were all members of a small group

* Read at the Cincinnati Convention, 1927.

who gathered around the table in one of the parlors of the second floor of the Auditorium Hotel of Chicago on November 28, 1914 and organized this Association. I am going to read you today extracts from the letters of each member of this group from whom I have heard in regard to the founding and functioning of this Association.

Let me give you a brief paragraph of history before I approach the reading of these passages. In the fall of 1913 at the time of the Thanksgiving meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, a good many teachers in this field were present at Chicago. One morning, I think it was the morning after the English Council had adjourned, a group of us sat down to talk over the possibility of organizing a National Association in our own field. I cannot recall just who was present at that meeting in the fall of 1913. I doubt if any record or list was ever made. The committee was, as I recall it, a rather accidental one. No call had been sent out and no formal meeting definitely prepared for. But a committee was formed at that meeting to investigate the opinion of teachers in this field in regard to the desirability of a national organization of our forces either as a part of the English Council, as a separate organization, or in affiliation with some other educational group. Professor C. D. Hardy of Northwestern University was Chairman of that Committee, and the other members were Professor Woolbert then at the University of Illinois and myself. In addition to the three members who constituted this committee I am quite uncertain in regard to other men in attendance, though I can say that Professor Winans then of Cornell and Professor Lardner of Northwestern were certainly in that group in the fall of 1913. Let me now present to you a passage from the letter which the Chairman of this Committee, Professor C. D. Hardy of Northwestern University, wrote to me in answer to my inquiry this fall.

"In the fall of 1913 the public speaking teachers of the country met as a Section of the National Council of Teachers of English. There were perhaps fifty or seventy-five teachers of public speaking who met in their section of that council at that time. Discussion was as to whether it would be advisable for the public speaking teachers to organize an association of their own on a national basis. The discussion upon the floor in regard to

this matter raised a number of questions, among which were: Should we take immediate action? Were there teachers enough reported to warrant such action? Ought we not to get the thought of teachers of public speaking all over the country before we acted? The opinion was insisted upon by a few that our work could best be done as a Section of the Council for Teachers of English.

"To clear up this situation a Committee was appointed to communicate by correspondence with as large a number of teachers of public speaking as possible. That committee was appointed, and the members serving on it were yourself, C. H. Woolbert, and myself. We formulated a letter to be sent to all teachers of public speaking in the country, whether in Departments of English or in departments of their own. With that letter, we inclosed a card for response.

"The committee received replies from one hundred and twelve teachers of public speaking. One hundred and six of these replies were sufficiently definite to make it possible for us to draw some conclusions. The record of this one hundred and six shows that there were forty-three teachers of public speaking who did their work in Departments of English. There were sixty-three that did their work in separate departments. Of the one hundred and three who expressed their preference as to how a National Association should be organized—if and when it was organized—the record shows the following: Twenty-two reported in favor of continuing the organization of the teachers of speech as a Section of the National Council of Teachers of English. Eighty-one of the one hundred and three replied expressing a preference for a separate National Association of Teachers of Speech.

"At the next meeting of our teachers of speech, our committee reported the results of our investigation; and acting upon this report, the present NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH was organized.

"As I recall, the basic principles we had in mind were about as follows: The teachers in speech of the country must form their own association, if they are going to give their work dignity and influence. Second, a separate association was necessary in order to solidify the interests of the teachers of speech. Third, a national association was imperative, if a QUARTERLY JOURNAL was to be pub-

lished that would be of sufficient strength and worth to make such publication worthwhile. Fourth, the National Association was necessary, if research work in the field of speech was to be stimulated.

"In stating these principles, I may not have covered our entire thought; but I think, in essential matters, I have about stated the elements that guided the promoters of the present organization of the teachers of speech in the country.

"As is true with all similar organizations, it may be said that not all objectives, held in mind by those who promoted the present organization, have been accomplished as thoroughly or perfectly as the promoters desired. On the whole, however, it does seem to me that the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH have promoted those ends for which it was organized. For example: Numbers have greatly increased; a spirit of solidarity, in the interest in speech objectives, has been developed; a creditable QUARTERLY JOURNAL has been issued; and research work of real worth has been done. I think that, under the impetus given by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, there has been an interest in research that did not exist prior to its organization. I question very much, if, in any other field of educational activity, more rapid progress has been made. Much more remains to be accomplished, no doubt; but the present state of the organization has justified its promotion."

And so we were organized. And now in answer to the question of what was in the minds of the men who organized this Association and to what extent in their opinion is the Association accomplishing the purposes for which the Association was formed, I feel that I cannot do better than to present to you in their own words the comment of the other members of this organizing group.

The following is a letter from Professor F. M. Rarig, Chairman of the Department of Speech in the University of Minnesota:

"According to my recollection, the purposes in the minds of those who hoped to found the present NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH were the following:

1. The separation of Speech as a profession and as an academic subject from English.
2. The establishment of Speech in colleges and universities as a separate and worthy academic subject.
3. The development of a body of knowledge worthy of such an

academic subject through the encouragement of research in the scientific phases of the field.

4. The establishment and publishing of a JOURNAL which would circulate among the members of the profession, and furnish them with means of communication as to the results of research work, and of teaching methods and teaching problems.

"It seems to me that all these objectives have either been measurably attained, or are in the process of attainment.

"The contributions of individual members of the Association are too numerous to mention. The bound volumes of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, it seems to me, are impressive evidence of the work that has already been done, and the perusal of these volumes will furnish sufficient evidence of this work.

"Two jobs which it seems to me the ASSOCIATION might very well tackle are closely related to each other. One is that of securing recognition for Speech work in high schools, and the other is the working out of courses for high schools sufficiently uniform to deserve the characterization of standardized courses.

"Inasmuch as secondary education is being more and more dominated by colleges of education, and by state departments, it seems to me highly important that the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION take cognizance of this problem."

Professor J. L. Lardner of the School of Speech at Northwestern University at Evanston writes as follows:

"As I recall the arguments in favor of organizing the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, the outstanding issue was this: we needed an independent organization through which we could unify the university and college teachers of speech, and through which we could improve the scholastic standing of speech education in our colleges and universities. We felt the need for recognition, and for higher standards of excellence in our teaching, but we had no adequate organization that we could use to help us gain these ends.

"The National Speech Arts Association was practically dead, and furthermore, its purpose had been mainly to develop a platform type of Elocution and not Speech as a part of an educational program of a university. It could not properly meet the need without a complete re-organization. The Speech Section of the English Council under which several worthy speech people were operating, gave no promise of the independence and prominence and pro-

gress which active teachers of speech desired. Most of us thought it unwise to trust our future to the whims and desires of an English group.

"Hence, we formed the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SPEECH EDUCATION—with a new, scholastic, independent program."

Professor Harry Bainbridge Gough, head of the Department of Public Speaking at DePauw University has this to say:

"First, association with a view to mutual help.

"Second, dissemination of information relative to our work among the group and perhaps to educators generally. I recall that at the time in a general way our work was emerging from the long continued mothering of the English department. It was our purpose to take a good look or to afford a good look at the swaddling infant.

"Third, standardization. You will recall that our conventions largely at first considered this problem, and indeed must continue to consider it."

Professor Manley Phelps of Northwestern University comments as follows:

"The person who teaches speech today is quite a different animal from the one who taught Elocution, Public Speaking, etc. twelve years ago. Twelve years is a small span in the history of mankind, yet what has been accomplished in the speech world in that time is almost unbelievable until one stops to think about it and to look back.

"In large measure, these are some of the things which the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION has brought about.

1. We now have a common name for what we are doing.
2. We now have academic standing and recognition. I can remember when one was almost forced to apologize for himself to another faculty member when he explained that although he was a member of the English Department he was teaching oratory.
3. We have taken stock of ourselves, found out how much we don't know, and set to work to study, to investigate, to experiment, to put our teaching on a real basis of scholarship and understanding.
4. Not only are our general speech courses on a sounder basis, but we have broadened our horizon and have begun to realize the broad scope of our work.

5. We have more dignity and pride and faith in ourselves and our profession.

"These are just some of the things the National Association has done in these few years. A good record surely.

"Much yet remains to be done. Inasmuch as this is a short letter, I shall not even attempt to enumerate."

Professor J. A. Winans of Dartmouth College has the following to say about our organization and about our function:

"I suppose we were, some of us, trying to grow; and also we longed for a little touch with others of our kind. We had been isolated, marooned on rather desert islands. We began to meet, in the eastern and otherwise and began to discover that the belief most of us had that all the other teachers of speaking were freaks, was not altogether sound. We found that we could learn something from others, no matter how wrong they seemed to us. At least we could quarrel with them, and that meant a lot after the indifference we suffered at home. It helped our inferiority complexes to find others who would quarrel with us, and to spend two or three days telling each other how important our work was.

"It was the desire to meet with our kind and compare notes. Then we began to hope that we might make progress, do research, become scientists and scholars, or what you will. It all meant new life, hope and ambition. But the real urge in the beginning was just to get together and get bucked up.

"I think we have succeeded beyond any dreams I had at the time, almost too well. I often regret the passing of the days of small things, when the meetings were to me a delight and a joy that lasted till I could begin to look to the next. That is no longer true. Too big and confused; but I know it is for the best. And still I would not miss going if I could help it in any reasonable way.

"But the main question is not what we now are and whither are we tending; but chiefly what did we hope to be."

Lew Sarett of Northwestern University somewhat varies the general statement as follows:

"Why did we break with the English folk and start our own national organization? There were two definite reasons. First, we were indisposed to continue to be in our respective institutions the tail of the English Department, wagged at will, sat upon from time

to time, and held remote from the nourishment end of the creature. Secondly, a growing professional consciousness, a finer professional unity, a feeling that our professional interests as a whole would be greatly fostered,—these factors contributed.

"Are we doing what we then thought we should do? Approximately, yes. We have grown rapidly in numbers, in solidarity, in the body of professional knowledge we have turned up. The only adverse criticism I should care to make is that our growth, our thinking, our interests, our development,—these have not been balanced, properly proportioned. We are working too intensively in some fields, and not intensively enough in others. We have succumbed to the Prussian idea of university education—an educational ideal that—I insist—has yet to prove itself for America (save in its graduate schools); an ideal and method that should be the last to be adopted by teachers of English and teachers of speech. Like a lot of sheep we have followed the philologists, the scientists. In the name of productive scholarship we have tried to make speech—most of it 'public speaking'—a laboratory science. For some aspects of speech this is sound enough; but for most aspects of speech it is ridiculous."

Professor Cochran of the Department of Public Speaking at Carleton College has this to say:

"It was the hope, I believe, of those who were present at that revolutionary meeting and who assisted in bringing about a Declaration of Independence, that it would greatly stimulate research work, promote more effective teaching and bring about greater interest in the meetings of the ASSOCIATION for teachers of Public Speaking. In my humble judgment the hope has been realized. In fact, I believe that every charter member looks, not only with considerable satisfaction, but with a great deal of pride upon the progress that has been made in the work in Public Speaking, in the recognition that it has been given in the curriculum of our best schools and in the greatly increased attendance at and interest in our annual meetings."

Professor J. S. Gaylord of the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, puts it this way:

"Some of the motives which were in our minds and hearts when we formed the association are:

To be free from the domination of the English Council;

To have more time for programs and discussions;

To further research work in our field;

To publish our studies from time to time;

To win recognition in educational institutions as a department of study, teaching, and research;

To have more favorable opportunities for developing the ethics of our profession;

To be of more help to each other.

"No doubt we were influenced by many subconscious motives, of which only a few have yet come to conscious endeavor.

"It seems to me that the association has on the whole been very successful in fulfilling the purposes for which it was founded. There have certainly been many important changes in our thinking and theories. Our practice has not improved as much as our investigation. Some of us have been somewhat disappointed that more progress has not been made in the application of principles to studying and teaching speech. The big problem ahead of us is to improve our methods and technique of speech education."

Professor Charles H. Woolbert of the University of Iowa who was Chairman of the meeting in which this Association was organized writes as follows:

"We held our 'rump convention,' to see what we could do to make Speech separate from English. The only thing a speech man could find by way of a gathering of his profession was in a section of the English Council. The English Council in those days was in spirit and effect a secondary school enterprise. The leaders of it were avowedly interested in the high-school problem. They felt that at the high-school level Speech and English should be treated as one. So they assumed that in giving Speech a sectional meeting and in inviting the speech people to coöperate in the general meetings, they were meeting the speech teacher's problem. And to a certain extent they were.

"The split-off was brought about by college teachers. These found little to satisfy their needs in the meetings of the English Council. They had repeatedly made an earnest attempt to get greater consideration for their peculiar needs, but with no very noticeable effect. After a particularly exasperating convention experience, a group remained after the adjournment of the English Council session to talk over the advisibility of forming an associa-

tion of our own. While it was not then so expressed, it is apparent now that the chief intention was to make better provision for the college teacher of Speech. So fifteen of us got around a table at the Auditorium Hotel and canvassed the possibilities.

"Because I had been chairman of the speech section of the English Council that year I was made chairman of the conference. I mention this because I recall with great distinctness the number of times the meeting seemed about to break up in complete futility. We represented distinctly diverse views and feelings, and every once in a while the sentiment would seem to be dominant that we did not know what we wanted and that further discussion was of little avail. But we passed from one parliamentary crisis to another, gave every man a chance to express his mind as fully as he wished, and gradually began to center on our one main purpose; to provide the teacher of Speech with an organization that he could call his own, especially teachers in colleges.

"I feel that the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION has grown and developed and progressed far beyong any expectations of the group that started it. Beyond any question we builded better than we knew. We were rebels starting a revolution, what it would lead to we had only the haziest of notions. Individuals may have seen clearly—of which I was not one; but I feel sure that as a group we did not envisage what has happened since, any more than now we can see what will happen in the next ten years.

"For my part I am immensely proud of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION. We represent some strikingly divergent groups; with a common interest, yes, but with many, many degrees of emphasis. We have had our own tempestuous times, and once or twice I think we sailed pretty close to the rocks; but I am sure that now we are sailing prettily on the deep high seas. I think we are a good example of a ship that has found itself, and the creaking in the joints and in the machinery comes nearer and nearer to being a cheerful song of rejoicing."

Such, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the testimony of a majority of the group of men who founded this ASSOCIATION. What is there left for me to say? Only that these are my sentiments, too. We organized the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION for the promotion of research and better teaching in speech. True, most of us at the time called what we were doing public speaking, but already in many places

this had become an inaccurate label. The broader conception of the whole field of human speech was even at that time taking shape in our professional thinking. I can testify as have these, my colleagues, that the activities of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION and its QUARTERLY JOURNAL have, beyond any question, promoted research and better teaching. They have contributed to the ambition, the efficiency, and the accomplishments of men and women in this profession. They have in specific instances helped to make possible achievements that, so far as I know, no one ever conceived as possible before the days of our ASSOCIATION and JOURNAL.

You have heard what many of the charter members have said in regard to our future development. I shall not make further comment upon their statements, but for myself I am glad to say that I also believe that the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION and the QUARTERLY JOURNAL should and will continue to grow as they have grown in scope and in power. In the letters that I have just read a number of men have referred to our diversity, to the different types of interest in our field, different backgrounds and objectives for different members of our ASSOCIATION. It is unquestionably a fact that this diversity is one of our outstanding characteristics. We should admit it, recognize it, and on it build our diverse yet unified profession. This very fact gives us a unique and peculiarly significant place in liberal education. We use and fuse and coordinate more different kinds of knowledge than almost any other liberal department. In this we are like the professional fields of engineering or medicine—built upon many basic sciences.

Our backgrounds must be somewhat more diverse and our activities as scholars and teachers are and must be more varied than the activities and the scholarly backgrounds of teachers in most regular academic departments. We need this in order to appropriate our necessary borrowing or adaptations from the various sciences and arts which we have to draw upon. We need as a field —no particular individual needs all of these—but, as a field, we need findings, knowledge, processes, assistance, from the philologist, from the linguist, from the psychologist, from the anatomist, the physiologist, the physicist, the historian, and from the students of literature, if you care to make the students of literature a group not included in the term philologists. This may seem to some like saying that the teacher of speech needs to be an educated

man. But that won't quite do, because we all know that not every educated man could be a competent teacher of speech. The teacher of speech, it seems to me, should be a well-educated man, who during an important period of his formal education, preferably his graduate years, has it in mind that he is going to be a teacher of speech. The particular function of the university departments of speech must be to turn out, or to help in turning out, this kind of a well-educated and competent teacher of speech, who shall be to whatever extent is desirable a specialist in his own particular interest in this diversified field. The essential nature of our profession makes it necessary that such teachers and investigators be sent into the profession from our university departments if this ASSOCIATION is to achieve still more completely the objective for which thirteen years ago it was brought into being.

TRAINING IN CONVERSATION

RAYMOND F. HOWES
Washington University

I

THAT conversation is closely allied to public speaking has long been recognized. Professors Winans and Woolbert, to name but two of a number of recent writers, stress the need in public speaking of conversational quality. But conversation itself, despite this connection, has generally been neglected by teachers of speech. The time seems to be coming when this neglect must end. American pride has been hurt by recent statements that in this country the art of conversation is declining. The burden of remedying this condition will inevitably be thrust upon the schools; and the schools, in all probability, will pass it on to the teachers of speech.

If conversation is to be taught, it must be reduced to rules. Those rules must be based upon a guiding principle; and such a principle, so far as I can discover, has never been established. Almost everything else has been done by one writer or another. Professor Tinker has traced the history of the salon; Miss Heseltine has written a history of conversation from the Middle Ages to the present; Stevenson and others have discoursed upon the ad-

vantages of talk; Professor Mahaffy, a confirmed classicist, has reduced it to categories, many of them meaningless; others, such as De Quincey, Lord Chesterfield, Henry Taft, and J. B. Priestley, have offered individual concepts of it and have suggested rules of conduct; more rules have been laid down in recent texts.

These writers list the advantages of conversation: clarifying thought, discovering new associations of ideas, gaining and imparting knowledge, entertaining others and being entertained, satisfying the ego. They outline its aims: persuasion, instruction, and entertainment. They tell what good conversation has been, and what they think it ought to be. But not one of them gives a basic principle by which the quality of conversation can be judged.

De Quincey suggestes two rules: that the time of each speaker be limited in order that all may talk, and that a symposiarch be appointed to keep the discussion on fertile ground. Both rules, however, have many exceptions. All of us have heard good conversation which no symposiarch controlled. The first rule was tried and found wanting in the eighteenth century bluestocking clubs. In Mrs. Montagu's club, for example, the guests were seated in a circle and called upon in turn. The result prompted Lady Louisa Stuart to write that "the circular form is convenient to prosers and people who love to hear themselves talk, so you might . . . come in for the most tiresome dissertations, the dullest long stories, the flattest jokes anywhere to be found."

The rules suggested by Professors Harrington and Fulton in their recent text are not only, like De Quincey's, inadequate, but also, in several instances, ludicrous. These teachers declare that good conversation never becomes an argument. Yet in the early Italian conversation groups an argument between two of the company was considered the highest form of entertainment; Dr. Johnson declared argument essential to first rate conversation; and Stevenson opens his discussion of talk with the general statement that "the spice of life is battle." The authors of the text go on to give such advice as this: "Let the face display a genial expression," since "almost anything said with a smile will be accepted." (It might be remarked in passing that if this is the true secret of persuasion, a multitude of intelligent men, from Corax down, have wasted a scandalous amount of time and energy, and that the only proper function of a convention of teachers of speech is to

sing "Lock a Little Sunbeam Down in Your Heart" and "Smile, Smile, Smile.") "Keep the voice quiet and in the tone of doubt or questioning." "Start the conversation with such expressions as 'I am thinking...,' 'What do you think...?' 'Is it possible that...?' "Shades of all the great conversationalists in history rise up to protest. Imagine Dr. Johnson starting every remark with "Is it possible...?" Imagine Martin Luther keeping his voice always quiet and in a tone of questioning. Imagine Coleridge tracing the intricate paths of German metaphysics with a perpetual grin.

The rule most universally insisted upon, however, is that no speaker should monopolize the talk. If this rule is accepted, it immediately invalidates the theory that public speaking can be conversational, for the public speaker definitely does all the talking. But the rule need not be accepted, for excellent conversationalists break it constantly. One friend of De Quincey remarked that "he never monopolized talk, allowed everyone to have a fair chance, and listened with respectful patience to the most commonplace remarks from any one present." Indeed, a story of De Quincey and Dr. Burton is recorded that has all the characteristics of an Alphonse-Gaston act: both had started to talk at the same instant, and neither would proceed. Yet on another occasion, with a different companion, De Quincey, according to the report, "did all the talking." Likewise Oscar Wilde, according to Frank Harris and Richard Le Gallienne, always took an interest in what others had to say. "He did not (says Le Gallienne) monopolize the conversation: he took the ball of talk wherever it happened to be at the moment and played with it." Yet when at Oxford, Wilde was particularly attracted to Walter Pater because he could not talk but was an admirable listener. And on one occasion, having been invited to dine with a group of fox-hunting country squires, Wilde talked all the evening while they clustered around to listen. Thus the talkers least given to monopolizing conversation do it when they see that they alone can keep the whole company interested.

Not one of these rules, therefore, is without a flaw. Yet most of them were suggested for a definite purpose. What was that purpose? To avoid boredom. A person who has no chance to talk throughout a long evening usually is bored. When conversa-

tion drifts to unfruitful topics, many will be bored. When two persons argue too long, the rest of the company will be bored. When one takes all the talk, he is apt to bore everybody. The basic law of good conversation, therefore, is that it must be interesting. *The best conversation is that which most successfully sustains the attention of every member of the group.*

II

A direct corollary to this law is that the good conversationalist (1) must have a fund of interesting things to say, (2) must be able to say them effectively, and (3) must have a lively sense of communication with the rest of the group.

The development of a fund of interesting things to say cannot be made an object of a course in conversation, for conversation has no definite subject matter. Any subject within the range of human knowledge or speculation may, under given circumstances, become a topic of conversation. Preparation for general conversation includes the whole range of the individual's experience: his reading, thinking, travels, contact with interesting persons, with the theatre, with business, with politics—in short, with all phases of life. Various people have tried specific schemes of preparation. Sheridan worked out an epigram or two before going to an afternoon tea and by subtle manipulation made an opportunity to display them; Samuel Rogers kept a notebook containing critical opinions on contemporary literature and anecdotes about famous acquaintances; Leigh Hunt had a set of bye-phrases and quaint allusions always at hand to produce a laugh. But none of these schemes was successful enough to warrant imitation. Indeed, the student who tries to use them will probably do himself more harm than good; for good conversation demands spontaneity. The slightest hint of affectation, of artificiality, breaks the charm. The best one can do, therefore, is to keep informed on subjects about which his circle of friends have shown particular interest. He can prepare, in a very general way, for a series of conversations with the same group; he cannot prepare specifically for any particular occasion. Material for conversation is an individual possession; it cannot be imparted to a class in a single college course.

The technique of presentation in conversation, like the material, must be drawn chiefly from outside sources. If the con-

verser's purpose is to persuade, he can draw most of his rules from argumentation and public speaking; if his purpose is to instruct, he can apply the principles of public speaking and exposition; if his purpose is to entertain, he needs primarily a knowledge of methods of sustaining attention. There is little that distinguishes effective presentation in conversing from effective presentation in public speaking except a shift of emphasis as to tone and purpose. Conversation usually is more informal and demands more entertainment. Mahaffy makes entertainment the primary object of talk; Miss Heseltine says that its most important object is enjoyment.

The most important difference between conversation and public speaking, however, is bound up with the speaker's sense of communication. Good public speaking has been called a dialogue; the speaker must adapt his speech to his audience by reacting to signs of approval, disapproval, or boredom. Good conversation is more complicated. True, the conversationalist, as Lord Chesterfield says, may "read in the countenances of good company their approbation or dislike" of what he is saying; but he may also be interrupted, questioned, or silenced by another talker. Or someone may change the subject. The converser, therefore, must have a greater range of adaptability. He must be continually alert to reactions of the other members of the group and be able to tell when to use different methods of sustaining attention, when to stop talking, and when to change the subject.

Some persons seem to know all this by intuition. Others must be trained. Can such training be given? To some extent, yes. If the teacher can make the student realize his limitations of knowledge and experience, can develop in him a lively sense of communication and a sincere interest in the ideas of others, and can make him recognize his responsibility as a member of any group to talk when he can best entertain or instruct and to keep still when someone else can best entertain or instruct, that student will seldom be a bore in conversation.

The problems still unanswered are: (1) When should conversation be taught? and (2) how can it be taught? In my opinion it should be taught, if at all, in conjunction with a college course in Public Speaking. By the time the student is ready for this training, he will have completed some part of his college career; he

should therefore be able to talk with some intelligence and interest on a number of subjects. Further, he will be familiar with the principles and practice of sustaining attention and perhaps with the theory and practice of argumentation. Conversation will involve merely a new application of this knowledge and skill.

To be effective, instruction in conversation should be concealed. The teacher who, following the advice of Professors Harrington and Fulton, selects a particular topic, seats several members of the class in a semi-circle, and assumes the attitude, "What ho, children, we shall now converse," cannot expect beneficial results. The ensuing conversation will be stilted, trivial, uninteresting. One needs no more proof that that given in the professors' own text.[1] Any instruction in conversation which stresses manner above content will inevitably be poor.

[1] The following example is given on page 22 of *Talking Well:*

"The teacher calls out six students who sit in a semicircle, the teacher at the end.

"*Teacher*—While in St. Louis I read every evening this electric sign: 'If you had to give up one of these three things—electric lights, telephone, automobile—which would you give up?' Mr. Lyon, which would you give up?

"*Mr. Lyon*—Well, I think I would give up the electric light.

"*Teacher*—Why?

"*Mr. Lyon*—Well, you see they are not necessary. More than one-half the people do not have them—farmers, small towns, and like that.

"*Teacher*—But neither do the farmers have the phone, do they?

"*Mr. Lyon*—Yes, most farmers have telephones and automobiles.

"*Teacher*—Which would you give up, Mr. Shinn?

"*Mr. Shinn*—I agree with Mr. Lyon, I would give up the electric lights.

"*Teacher*—Did you ever study by gas light? Wasn't it rather hot, especially in summer? Didn't you have a headache after a short while?

"*Mr. Shinn*—Yes, but you don't study much in summer, and in winter the gas helps to heat the room.

"*Teacher*—But how about those artificial lights that don't give off any heat, but do use up oxygen?

"The above dialogue represents in a small measure the way the exercise should be conducted. Mr. Shinn, it should be noted, hoped to escape with very little talking by agreeing with the first speaker."

Obviously such a conversation is trivial, unreal, uninteresting—nearly everything the conversation should not be. And Mr. Shinn, who contributes the only sentence verging on sincerity and interest, is the one selected for condemnation by the authors.

Training in conversation can therefore be given most effectively in conjunction with class discussions of speeches in a general course in Public Speaking. It is not difficult to relax the parliamentary form of procedure enough to allow students to talk directly to one another, to ask questions, offer illustrations, or proffer comment. The instructor, while keeping himself in the background as much as possible, can cut short talkers when they begin to bore others; encourage shy students, by well-placed questions, to speak; force those who speak in generalities to furnish specific instances; enforce logical thinking by judicious use of dialectic; encourage interesting digressions but cut short uninteresting ones —in short, help the students to form correct habits of conversing instead of teaching them a list of rules and exhibiting a group of specimens. The students may never realize that they have had training in conversation; but the instructor's satisfaction should be no less great because his beneficient influence is unrecognized.

Hence, although it seems to me impossible to construct a complete course in conversation, much useful training can be given by any teacher of speech in conjunction with a regular course in Public Speaking. The battle cry of these teachers must be, "Outlaw the bore." The objects of other crusades may have been more noble, but none can ever be more worthy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL WORKS

C. B. TINKER, *The Salon and English Letters*, New York, 1915.

THOMAS DEQUINCEY, *Collected Writings*, David Masson (ed.), Vol. X, "Conversation," London, 1897.

R. L. STEVENSON, *Memories and Portraits*, "Talk and Talkers," 1887. Essay reprinted by H. S. Canby and F. E. Pierce in *Selections from Robert Louis Stevenson*, New York, 1911.

OLIVE HESELTINE, *Conversation*, New York, 1927.

J. B. PRIESTLEY, *Talking*, New York, 1926.

HENRY W. TAFT, *An Essay on Conversation*, New York, 1927.

J. P. MAHAFFY, *The Principles of the Art of Conversation*, London, 1887.

TEXTS

W. L. HARRINGTON AND M. G. FULTON, *Talking Well*, New York, 1924.

R. C. BORDEN AND A. C. BUSSE, *How to Win an Argument*, New York, 1926.

ALICE E. CRAIG, *The Speech Arts*, New York, 1927. Chap. XXII.

SAMUEL JOHNSON

JAMES BOSWELL, *Life of Johnson*, C. G. Osgood, (ed.), New York, 1917.

JOHN BAILEY, *Dr. Johnson and His Circle*, New York, 1913.

C. B. TINKER, *The Salon and English Letters*, Chap. XII, New York, 1915.

COLERIDGE

H. N. COLERIDGE, "The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge," *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. LII, Aug., 1834.

EDITORIAL, *Fraser's Magazine*, Vol. X, Oct., 1834.

MRS. M. E. SANDFORD, *Thomas Poole and His Friends*, London, 1888.

H. C. ROBINSON, *Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, Etc.*, Edith J. Morley (ed.), Manchester, 1922.

THOMAS DE QUINCEY, "Samuel Taylor Coleridge" in *Tait's Magazine*, Vol. I, 1834.

EMILE LEGOUIS, *The Early Life of Wordsworth*, tr. by J. W. Matthews, London, 1897.

J. D. CAMPBELL, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, London, 1894.

J. C. SHAIRP, *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, New York, 1872.

A. P. RUSSELL, *Characteristics*, New York, 1896.

LUCY E. WATSON, *Coleridge at Highgate*, London, 1925.

OSCAR WILDE

FRANK HARRIS, *Oscar Wilde: His Life and Confessions*, New York, 1916.

RICHARD LE GALLIENNE, *The Romantic 90's*, New York, 1926.

MISCELLANEOUS

G. W. E. RUSSELL, *Sydney Smith*, New York, 1905.

Wit and Wisdom of the Rev. Sydney Smith, London, 1886.

GRENVILLE KLEISER, *Talks on Talking*, New York, 1916.

Table Talk in the Home.

JAMES HOGG, *De Quincey and His Friends*, London, 1895.

BEN JOHNSON, *Discoveries*, G. B. Harrison (ed.), New York, 1923.

LORD CHESTERFIELD, *Letters to His Godson*, the Earl of Carnarvon (ed.) Oxford, 1890.

EDITORIAL

FROM RHETORIC DELIVER US

In an address delivered before the Convocation of the University of the State of New York last October, and published in *School and Society* December 24, 1927, Professor Paul Shorey followed good classical precedents in characterizing our democracy as a tyranny of orators. The domination of ancient democracies by rhetoric is a commonplace of history, he said, but,

> . . . one of the most amazing illusions of modern optimism is the commonplace that science and critical scholarship have changed all this, and that our minds are no longer so easily swayed by rhetoric as were the minds of the ancients. That may be partially true of a few critical and scientific minds. But man in the mass is still as ever even more a rhetorical animal than he is a political, a logical, or a laughing animal. What deceives us is that tastes in rhetoric change, and certain forms of long-winded, sonorous, old-fashioned bombast no longer appeal to the sophisticated among us. In this sense rhetoric may be defined as the other fellow's fine writing. But if we take rhetoric in its truer and broader sense as a misuse of any kind of fallacy, irrelevance, ornament, emotion, suggestion, wit, epigram, to gain some undue advantage over sober reason and fact, then there never has been a time in the history of mankind when the power of rhetoric was so great . . . . The neglect of such study of rhetoric in our education is very surprising in view of the enormous and increasing part played by public speaking, directly, or in report and broadcast, in the formation of that public opinion which is the master of us all. You will perhaps doubt this neglect. . . . What I really mean is not that we don't study rhetoric in a fashion, but that we don't study it in the right way. . . . The dominant aim in all university teaching of these subjects [propaganda and advertisement, and their chief instrument, rhetoric, in all its manifold disguises] should be the establishment of a resisting immunity. It is no legitimate function of public education to teach men how to overreach and overpersuade their fellows. Its proper task is to enlighten and harden the minds of those who

> make up the staple of audiences against such attempts. I have no time to prove that exploitation is in fact the spirit of our teaching of such subjects as rhetoric, public speaking, psychology, advertising, education, and even history. It is a patent fact . . . . The teaching I postulate is entirely possible . . . .

Professor Shorey is not alone in his fear of professional persuaders. Joseph Jastrow, in "A New Idol of the Market-Place" sounds a similar warning. John Morley, years ago, said that a most useful service for extension lecturers would be to read aloud public speeches and documents, analyzing them and pointing out the fallacies. Stuart Chase, in books and magazine articles, is denouncing advertisers and their ways. A writer who takes for his essay the title "The Conservation of the Private Purse," suggests that we need game laws to protect our pocketbooks from the fate of the buffalo and the sage hen. Such books as *My Life in Advertising* also strongly emphasize the need for rhetorical preparedness.

Unfortunately, Professor Shorey had no time in this address to develop a technique for the teaching which is to deliver us from rhetoric. The very definition of rhetoric which he offers, however, would suggest that its thorough control in the interests of truth and justice is not simple: "rhetoric in its truer and broader sense as a misuse of any kind of fallacy, irrelevance, ornament, emotion, suggestion, wit, epigram, to gain some undue advantage over sober reason and fact." One is reminded, inevitably, of Judge Hoar's famous definition of swearing as the unnecessary use of profane language. An examination of the arguments of even so well-trained a humanist as Professor Shorey suggests that when he is attacking the pseudo-sciences or other objects of his scorn, he does not regard his own fallacies and irrelevancies as misused; in such an occupation, apparently, any stick will do to beat a dog with. And as for ornament, emotion, suggestion, wit, epigram, his own pages are made sparkling by them; whether he thereby gains some *undue* advantage over sober reason and fact, who shall say? Rhetorical argument has always characterized the assailants of rhetoric. The profession of ignorance or distrust of the tricks of rhetoric is often itself a rhetorical trick. Prime Minister Baldwin's speech against rhetoric was merely one way of calling his opponents rhetoricians. Carlyle's long and repetitious diatribe against the

stump-orator bears a remarkable resemblance to a stump speech. Bishop Jewell's Latin oration against rhetoric at Oxford in 1546 shows him a repentant but unreformed rhetorician. The early church fathers argued rhetorically against the use of rhetoric in sermons; and the most famous of all attacks on rhetoric, Plato's *Gorgias,* is full of sophistical argument and rhetorical ornament.

Not only have the foes of rhetoric been unable to escape its use in their deprecations; the writers on rhetoric have been quite unable to solve the problem of making rhetorical instruction scientific and efficient, and at the same time subservient only to truth and justice.

An apparently paradoxical insistence upon the beneficent function of rhetoric while setting forth methods that so easily become questionable could be illustrated by citations from many writers. Bishop Whately has given us his uncommon common sense about the difficulty:

> . . . it would savour of pedantic morality to give solemn admonitions against employing rhetorical artifices for 'making the worst appear the better reason,' since the generality will, according to their respective characters, make what use of a book they see fit, without waiting for the author's permission. But what I have endeavored to do, is clearly to set forth, as far as I could, these sophistical tricks of the Art; and as far as I may have succeeded in this, I shall have been providing the only effectual check to the employment of them . . . . The Artifices of the Orator are
>
> . . . like tricks by sleight of hand,
> Which, to admire, one should not understand;
>
> and he who has himself been behind the scenes of a puppet show, and pulled the strings by which the figures are moved, is not likely to be much affected by their performance.

The Bishop agrees with Professor Shorey as far as to say that one of the functions of the study of rhetoric is protection against rhetoric; but he does not share what seems to be Professor Shorey's belief or hope that the purpose of the teacher of rhetoric can control the general use of rhetoric; nor does his knowledge of possible abuses lead him to transfer his attention, as Professor Shorey suggests, from the few students who are attempting to acquire the art, to the many who need to be protected against it. To do this would be to assume that all rhetorical effectiveness is bad, which would be almost as far from the truth as the assumption that it is altogether

good. It would also assume that it is quite possible to impart a critical understanding of an art without any attempt to practise it. To make the study of rhetoric wholly theoretical would be, to use Professor Shorey's figure, to attempt to build up the immunity he desires without either exercise or inoculation. One cannot preserve one's health by merely listening to lectures on hygiene. Even if we accept Professor Shorey's point of view, and regard the art as an evil, enough comprehension of it to produce immunity might indirectly increase skill in *using* rhetoric, just as a course which aims wholly at producing skill, will indirectly produce a certain amount of resistance to the skill of others. It is as difficult to separate the offensive and defensive aspects of rhetoric as it is to distinguish between aggressive and defensive warfare.

But Professor Shorey not only oversimplifies the problem; he seems to be lacking in knowledge of rhetorical instruction in American colleges and universities. If he is merely making a general observation when he says that "it is no legitimate function of public education to teach men how to overreach and overpersuade their fellows," he has uttered a truism. If he believes the observation applies chiefly to rhetoric he should be reminded that all education helps in giving a man power to overreach and overpersuade his fellows, if disposed to do so. If it is meant as an indictment of present-day rhetorical instruction, as the statement that exploitation is the spirit of our teaching of rhetoric and public speaking would seem to indicate, then Professor Shorey stands in need of further information. It is unfortunately true that in the past the work in public speaking has been chiefly known in connection with contests, and it is to the training for these that Professor Shorey's criticism chiefly applies. Teachers have been faced with the necessity of quickly enabling immature and badly educated students to uphold the honor of the school by a successful appearance before a general audience. This has often resulted in methods that may justly be characterized as exploitation.

Happily, the energies of teachers of speaking in reputable institutions are no longer absorbed in contests. The growth of scholarship and research has been such that teachers cannot be competent in their field if they devote themselves largely to extra-curricular competitions; the spirit of scholarship and research is also an effective antidote to the spirit of exploitation. And while, as

we have already said, the spirit of the teacher or the classroom cannot be a sure protection against the evils that follow so often in the train of rhetoric, no one who is acquainted with the texts and writings of the leaders in speech training (may we distinguish them from Professor Shorey's "ambitious associate professors of English in the University of Texlahoma"?) could say that the spirit of exploitation is dominant.

But when we have made these reservations, there is much to be said for Professor Shorey's proposal, not so much as a substitute for present rhetorical instruction as a complement to it, and with the realization that all rhetorical instruction is inevitably a two-edged sword. Most teachers will agree with Isocrates that of the three elements that go to make up a rhetorician, natural ability, experience, and training, the smallest factor is training. The practical rewards of speaking are such that a large number of persons will somehow train themselves, or will speak effectively without training. While the able speaker will often deserve the gratitude of his fellows for his public services, he is usually able to see to it that he gets a more tangible reward. But the rewards for resisting rhetoric and sophistry are likely to be social rather than individual. To this extent public educational institutions might well feel that greater public interest attaches to building up a resistance to self-seeking speakers—advertisers, salesmen, propagandists—than to creating them.

There is the further point that while critical and creative training should not be entirely separated, in so far as they can be separated, it is a simpler matter to produce critical acumen than creative power. Training plays a greater part in the production of criticism; larger numbers of people can be brought up to a decent level at it. We recognize that not many persons in poetry courses will ever become poets; we justify the study of poetry and even practice in verse-writing for their critical rather than their creative effect. But speaking we view as a pedestrian accomplishment; we expect almost any college student to become a respectable performer after a period of training. The results hardly seem to justify this attitude; we might be better satisfied with the returns from the money and energy spent on rhetorical training if we cared more about producing educated and critical audiences.

It may well be, then, that teachers of rhetoric should have some course, or courses, in which they reverse the usual emphasis on performance, with a merely incidental growth of critical judgment, and aim specifically at the development of an intelligently critical attitude, contenting themselves with the incidental increase of performing ability that might result. Of course, it should be recognized that all college training tends to produce this attitude, just as it all contributes something to skill in speaking or writing; but the critical faculties are most effectively developed in connection with the material upon which they are to be used.

Of what would such a course consist? In the discussions of rhetoric by Plato and Isocrates we have a philosophical treatment of the function of rhetoric which raises practically all the questions one would desire to discuss today. The *Rhetoric* of Aristotle gives an admirably systematized view of the art, a penetrating analysis of human nature, and a philosophical notion of the relation of rhetoric to ethics, politics, logic, psychology, and literary criticism. These three writers would furnish a comprehensive view of the field of rhetoric, and they would give the point of view from which the many modern methods of persuasion could be studied. A study of public opinion, which is often dignified with the title of political science, is properly a part of rhetoric; much of what passes for social psychology is rhetoric; the books on crowd and mob psychology are studies in rhetoric. Economic theory relating to the wants of men may profitably be approached from the point of view of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. The study of American oratory (or the oratory of any nation) would gain in significance if approached from Professor Shorey's point of view. Historians have discarded George Bancroft's oratorical interpretation of history, and rightly so; but in their enthusiasm over the hidden economic motives underlying the actions once explained by reference to the rhetorical debates upon the questions, they have often failed to recognize the part played by the orators as instruments in economic movements. Students of literature usually dismiss American oratory as almost totally lacking in literary value, even though it was for a considerable period the most characteristic expression of American life. Such speeches as remain in the curriculum for study have usually been selected for their historical or literary interest, and the point of view of the student of rhetoric has been overlooked

altogether. Of course there still survives to some extent the custom of requiring school boys to declaim purple patches; but this is not a study of oratory; the practise has hurt literary taste and degraded the art of public address. But with the prevalent point of view, which insists upon regarding all speeches studied as models of composition, to be imitated, the teacher of rhetoric is somewhat embarrassed in the discussion of speeches which were enormously effective, but which are rhetorical in the degraded sense of the term. A comprehensive study of American oratory which attempted, not to praise or blame it, but to understand it in its relation to public opinion in American, would doubtless enable some students to use more skilfully the tricks they have studied, but it would make for a more intelligent hearing and reading of the public address of a student's own days as a citizen. This study can best be made from the point of view of the student of rhetoric. Professor Wichelns, in his essay, *The Literary Criticism of Oratory*, has pointed out the differences between literary and rhetorical criticism, but as yet we have little rhetorical criticism worth mentioning. Teachers of public speaking have been so entirely occupied with the difficult routine of training speakers that they have had no time for a type of critical study that seemed to bear only indirectly upon their work, or which might even seem hostile to it. Some teachers develop a type of professional-mindedness which regards all attacks upon the evils resulting from oratory as an attack upon the dignity of their own subject; they come to their classes to praise oratory, not to bury it. This is not only a loss to scholarship, it injures the quality of elementary training in speaking. Critical and analytical study of rhetoric and oratory should not be limited to those who expect to become professional speakers or writers, or to those who expect to teach; it should be offered to all students who desire to understand the significance of rhetoric in modern life.

A strictly scientific attitude toward the art of rhetoric would not regard it as either good or bad; as a faculty of persuading human being it operates upon principles as unmoral as the laws of chemistry. But practically we cannot ignore the logical and ethical aspects. These elements as they have appeared in all forms of public address can best be studied with considerable freedom from the practical aim of immediate personal proficiency. Such study

involves a rhetorical analysis of all the various attempts to influence public opinion—in politics, religion, education, advertising, —propaganda of all kinds. Not too much moral uplift should be demanded of such instruction, nor should it be made too rigidly righteous; more is to be expected from the wide publicity given rhetorical artifice than from the effects of the moral indignation of the teacher. But the detached atmosphere of the classroom is an excellent place to begin the formation of logical and moral judgments upon appeals to the public. Professor Shorey deserves our gratitude for calling attention so forcibly to a neglected aspect of education; intelligent efforts should be made to develop the necessary materials and technique.

THE FORUM

THE TOURNAMENT IDEA IN HIGH-SCHOOL DEBATING

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: There are district high-school basketball tournaments which culminate in a state contest. A like situation applies in some states to debate. There are any number of possibilities in organization and arrangements, and it is not my purpose here to enumerate them. Active high-school debating leagues flourish in several states. I have no doubt that they are doing some good in giving high-school debaters valuable platform experience, and that they are beneficial as an educational enterprise in stimulating discussion of a leading public question before audiences scattered throughout the length and breadth of the state. I do not question that much good debating results and that the necessary competitive rivalry between schools is stimulated.

But frankly, will not the high schools gain more if they ape the colleges in one respect: adopt the individual scheduling of debates? Of course, Pi Kappa Delta, and perhaps Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha (I am in ignorance as to the latter two) sponsor tournaments among the colleges, both national and sectional, but the customary arrangement for a college is to schedule debates with whomever it pleases . It may be a member of a state or sectional conference, but this is far from participating in a tournament. State college forensic conferences frequently do not even declare a winner, and very few, if any, have a tournament. The schools are relatively free in the matter of scheduling debates in this conference, just as a football coach is relatively free in scheduling his games in an athletic conference. Colleges, too, contract debates outside the conference, while a high school under the tournament idea works toward its district contest as its sole aim, and with question, sides, and opponent practically dictated for it.

High schools should have this freedom of colleges in scheduling debates. They should determine for themselves just what they

want to debate, whom they want to debate, when, and where. If we must organize, then the dual, the triangle, the quadrangle, and the pentagon or hexagon are much more wholesome than the tournament.

What are we trying to do in the high school? Do we aim to win tournaments, or to give a group of alert, eager young minds a chance to grow? Must we train for a district contest or be free to develop youngsters? Are we basketball "coaches" or debate "teachers"?

Under the scheduling-as-one-pleases idea, a debate teacher is free to look over his possibilities. He probably has preferences as to questions. He would like to debate certain schools, and at a certain time. He can shift his line-up as he pleases between debates, he can experiment, he can use a maximum of speakers. (Frequently, under the tournament, a school can use only three speakers, who must take both sides of the question. In some arrangements, if a school is defeated in its first debate, it is out of the running. For most of the squad the time of preparation, very strenuous and very earnest in most cases, is largely wasted. The debate teacher under the freedom-of-schedule plan is not restricted by the autocratic, hide-bound measures of a holier-than-thou state body or body of district officers.

What is the type of debating that emerges from the tournament system? Usually the "coach-made" type that is so obnoxious to all lovers of good debate. A superintendent of schools went so far as to suggest to me that the debates were not competitions between schools, but between coaches. An egotistic coach of debate (I will not dignify him by calling him a debate "teacher") with a Master's degree made the remark to a rival coach on the evening of the debate between the two schools entered in the tournament, that any coach with just a Bachelor's degree could not hope to win from a coach with an M. A. degree to his credit.

Not that coach-made debates are not possible under all types of debating, or that, even in the tournament, good debating free from the fingers of the coach, does not appear. But the conditions are much more conducive to the coach-made type of debate under the tournament plan because of the fear of elimination and the pressure of winning. Many coaches write speeches, prepare briefs, help read, and do about everything except deliver the speech. The

weakness of high-school students in rebuttal and the lack of adaptation they show is traceable to the unhealthful influence of the coach.

On the whole, independence of arrangements gives points of superiority not to be overlooked. It would be wise also for a high school to associate itself in the interests of good debate with such an organization as the National Forensic League, an honor society for high-school speakers, which does not interfere in the slightest with local arrangements or seek to dictate a policy or program.

RAYMOND H. BARNARD,
Lakewood High School

A TEACHER OF SPEECH LOOKS IN THE MIRROR

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: I am a teacher of Speech. I have taken many courses in the theory and practice of Speech. I have developed a technique. My habits are fixed; I speak according to my training.

For perfectly natural reasons I have a tendency to rate as the best speakers those students whose manner and deportment are most like my own. For me, there is one perfectly natural way to stand; I am accustomed to stand in that position. For me, there is one natural way to gesture; I have fixed certain gesture habits in myself. For me, there is one melody of which I am particularly fond; for I use a certain speech tune. For me, there is a certain amount of energy and variety that should be used in a good speech; for I am accustomed to expend a certain amount of energy. Because of my training and practice, I have a standard of speech effectiveness. And I tend to rate as the best speakers those students whose manner and deportment are most like my own.

I forget that there is one best way for each student to speak, even though that way may not be my way. I forget that the mold, the pattern for each student, should be made of his own individuality, of his own personality combined with the aesthetics of platform deportment and the technique of holding attention. I forget that a speaker may gain his ends and aims through a manner totally different from that which has been drilled into me. When recording grades, I forget that my way may not always be the best way.

It is my responsibility, therefore, as a teacher of Speech, to evolve an objective and non-personal standard of judgment, a standard which will neither defeminize the charm of womanhood nor emasculate the vigor and robustness of manhood, but a standard which will recognize and reward an aesthetic blending of the student's original self with the general principles of platform deportment.

Failing this, and allowing habit or personal preferences to influence my judgments, I am doing an injustice to those students who have trusted me to guide a phase of their development. But succeeding in obtaining this objective standard, I shall deal fairly and frankly with all those whose training and advancement are my responsibility and my reward.

C. T. S.
N. U.

NEW BOOKS

[New Books are sent to staff reviewers, but voluntary contributions are gladly considered. Manuscripts should be sent to Hoyt H. Hudson, Review Editor, Princeton University.]

Henry Ward Beecher: An American Portrait, by PAXTON HIBBEN. New York: Doran (now Doubleday, Doran & Company, Garden City), 1927: pp. 390.

D. L. Moody: A Worker in Souls, by GAMALIEL BRADFORD. New York: Doran, 1927: pp. 320.

"A good man skilled in speaking," the definition of an orator which Henry Ward Beecher adopted, seems hardly applicable to either himself or Moody in the light of these biographies. Mr. Hibben shows that Beecher was far from being a good man. Mr. Bradford credits Moody's gift of preaching to "instinct and force of nature." "He began by talking naturally to his Sunday-School class, because he had something to say, and kept it right up to the end." Moody himself once said, "If God has given you a message, go and give it to the people as God has given it to you. It is a stupid thing to try to be eloquent."

The principal difference between Mr. Hibben's analysis of the private life of Henry Ward Beecher and Sinclair Lewis's study of Elmer Gantry is that Mr. Hibben uses plenty of documentary evidence. Beecher, it is true, began as a temperance man and later in life "drank his wine and beer when he felt like it," whereas Elmer felt his call to the ministry in a drink of his room-mate's liquor but in following the call came eventually to denounce its source. In other respects the two were much alike. Charles A. Dana wrote in the New York *Sun*, "Henry Ward Beecher is an adulterer, a perjurer, and a fraud; and his great genius and his Cristian pretenses only make his sins the more horrible and revolting." Mr. Hibben doesn't take that attitude at all. He goes to considerable pains to prove Beecher's guilt, not in the spirit of scandalmongering or of moral judgment, but to reveal the emo-

tional life which was Beecher's source of power. Beecher estimated that six out of seven persons in any community were "fed by their hearts." "His gift was merely that he was articulate while they were not."

"As the healing years pass," writes the biographer, "there is less interest in Henry Ward Beecher's guilt and more in his genius—which is as it should be." Yet it was some years before Beecher could convince even himself, much less any one else, that he was endowed with the portion of genius which any member of the family of the great Lyman Beecher was normally expected to have. While preaching in his first church at Lawrenceburgh, Indiana, "Sunday after Sunday he would come home from his service with a headache and the determination to quit the ministry and buy a farm." But farms afforded no acceptable audiences and churches did. All his life Beecher loved an audience more than anything else; he even married in order to have one always available. Gradually he learned how to rule audiences—by saying only what they already believed but saying it with all the dramatic power of his emotional nature. And the six out of seven persons in any community found themselves blessed with the gift of tongues—in Henry Ward Beecher.

The hardship of his life lay in the difficulty of making sure before it was too late just what those six out of seven persons believed. He wanted to shout for the winning side, but he didn't want to wait until the shouting was all over. Slavery kept him painfully uncertain for years, although when he did make up his mind against it he could attack it with greater emotional zeal and dramatic effect than Wendell Phillips himself. He found that the very lack of intellectual restraint which made him so eloquent kept him from approaching an issue with any assurance. "It has been so all my life," he said. "At a distance I dread and brood and shrink from any weighty enterprise; but the moment the occasion arrives, joy shines clear, and an eager appetite to dash into the battle comes." The flesh was willing, and able, but the spirit was weak.

While Beecher was enjoying the climax of his ministry, the year of his auction of a slave-girl from Plymouth pulpit, D. L. Moody, nineteen years old, was converted to militant Christianity, and looking about for the place where he could find the largest

number of sinners to be saved, chose Chicago. "Preaching came upon him," Mr. Bradford writes, "as it were by accident. He went to a Sunday-School convention with a friend. The other expected speakers gave out or failed. The friend spoke while Moody prayed for him. Then the friend took the praying and Moody took the speaking turn.... Sixty conversions ensued on the spot." Between that time and his death in 1899 it is estimated that Moody addressed a hundred million people, and in the peculiar language of his contemporaries it is said that he reduced the population of hell by a million souls.

Genius and a love of fast horses were about all that Moody and Beecher had in common; their motives and methods were quite different. After conversing with Moody, Beecher said, "I thought I saw the secret of his working and plans. He is a believer in the second advent of Christ, and in our own time. He thinks it is no use to attempt to work for this world. In his opinion it is blasted —a wreck bound to sink—and the only thing that is worth doing is to get as many of the crew off as you can, and let her go." Moody himself said, "If I believed there was no hell, you would not find me going from town to town, spending day and night preaching and proclaiming the Gospel and urging men to escape the damnation of hell. I would take things easy." Beecher, on the other hand, was decidely more interested in this world. He eliminated hell altogether, for a time, until people protested; then he expurgated it. Moody seldom thought of himself and on one occasion publicly rebuked a brother evangelist for talking too much about himself. Beecher had the soul of an actor. "The springs of action were furnished by the impact of experience upon his own sensibilities; the theme was the development of his own emotions; the stage settings, his own imaginings. And from this hidden drama he never escaped—the dramatization of Henry Ward Beecher, played by Henry Ward Beecher." Partly because of his self-forgetfulness Moody received so little education that one observer wrote, "His enunciations may be pious, but his pronunciations are certainly off-color." Beecher was chosen to speak for American culture when Herbert Spencer was given his farewell dinner at Delmonico's. (It is interesting to note, however, that Spencer after hearing Beecher's oration wrote in his diary, "The proceedings were somewhat trying to sit through." Another guest

of the evening thought Beecher's speech the best he had ever heard; but Spencer does not mention it.)

Mr. Hibben's biography is a really notable work, substantial, fascinating, and convincing. He records both good and bad of his hero, usually with sympathy but always with candor. Mr. Bradford unfortunately is not so wise. His book is much shorter, but a large portion of it is given up to special pleading for Moody and gratuitous discussion of metaphysical matters of no immediate relevance. Even that would be entertaining if the book were as well-written as Mr. Hibben's. But it isn't.

V. E. SIMRELL, *Dartmouth College*

Intercollegiate Debates (Volume VIII). Edited by EGBERT RAY NICHOLS. New York: Noble and Noble, 1927: pp. viii, 565.

The reviewer has read the more or less verbatim reports of nine intercollegiate debates included in this volume without losing his faith in such exercises as high spots in the intellectual lives of students who engage in them. Nor has he lost his hope that debates may yet attract the audiences which they deserve and which they must have for their healthy continuance.

"Upon the whole the debates in this volume are of high standard and compare to advantage with debates previously published," Professor Nichols writes in his foreward. "This fact seems to indicate that the art of debate has made progress in the interim between the publication of the old series of Intercollegiate Debates and the beginning of this new series." The reader will doubtless agree, unless the reader is an old-time tight-case war-horse who misses from most of the debates here printed that emphasis upon thorough briefing which so often was manifested, in an earlier day, by the debaters' forcing the audience to memorize the brief.

Professor Nichols also makes interesting observations upon the visiting English speakers, saying that to the English student debating "is a form of amusement, has little or no educational significance, and can hardly be taken as seriously as bridge." Perhaps the English are aware that education, like so many other good things, is largely a by-product. And may not their debating have considerable "educational significance" without its being held up with the label "educational" upon it? The brilliant record of men from the Oxford and Cambridge Unions should not be

overlooked; and it should be mentioned that an English debater who is reported in the present volume, one who to an exaggerated degree exemplified the distinctive qualities which Professor Nichols in part praises and in part deplores, went home and wrote one of the best books ever written about the United States by a visiting Englishman, and is now writing leaders for the London *Times*.

One thing which American debaters may learn from their English visitors, but which they seem to learn slowly, is to listen to their opponents, and to recognize exactly what has been brought into controversy. On one page of *Intercollegiate Debates* we find a first affirmative speaker saying this (the subject is Recognition of the Soviet Government):

> Now in any discussion of the advisability of recognition or non-recognition of any country, it is necessary to have an understanding of the prerequisites of recognition. Julius Goebel, in his book, *The History of the Recognition Policy of the United States*, written under the tutelage of John Bassett Moore, says that there are two prerequisites for recognition: first, stability .... The other prerequisite of recognition is willingness to assume international obligations.

Some five minutes later and the first negative speaker has the floor; we hear him saying:

> The second point that must be taken into consideration in any discussion of recognition is the question of the conditions under which recognition can be granted. For our authority on this phase of the subject, we refer you to the book entitled *The Recognition Policy of the United States*, which is a doctor's thesis, prepared at Columbia University by Julius Goebel under the tutelage of John Bassett Moore. Here Dr. Goebel ... shows that our recognition policy contains three important conditions which have been consistently imposed upon governments desiring recognition. .... First, the new government must be stable; second, it must hold its place with the consent of the governed; and third, it must show an ability and willingness to discharge international obligations.

Now it is barely possible that the second speaker made reference to the first by vocal underscorings in the delivery of this passage. Aside from that contingency there are two possible explanations of such egregious ignoring of what had been said: one is temporary aphasia or deafness; the other, inability to alter by so much as a word or two a memorized passage, no matter how

loudly the occasion cries for its alteration. The second explanation better consorts with one's knowledge of the American college debater.

This case is so interesting that we should dwell upon it. After the first negative speaker took his seat, the second affirmative began. He had been sufficiently awake to notice that his opponent had found *three* requirements for recognition laid down by Dr. Goebel, as against his colleague's discovery of *two*. With an audacity which should not until this moment have gone unrebuked, he saw fit to say:

> My colleague in his constructive argument has proved that in the United States there are but three prerequisites for recognition.

But the second negative speaker, five minutes later, was unwilling to allow that the affirmative had proved anything—certainly not a point upon which there was no disagreement. So he began:

> Allow me to call to your attention that my colleague has proved that the American recognition policy is to recognize a government only when that government has fulfilled three conditions. . . .

Now one might suppose, after hearing it from the first negative speaker, from the second affirmative speaker, and from the second negative speaker, that there were laid down in Goebel's book (which had been introduced as authority by the first affirmative and used as such by the negative) *three* prerequisites for recognition. But listen to the first affirmative when he arises for rebuttal. He is going to stick to his original guns: he repudiates the thumping lie which his colleague has told in his behalf; he forgets all about Dr. Julius Goebel. He says:

> You will recall that at the outset of the debate we pointed out that there were two prerequisites of recognition. First, stability, and second, willingness to assume international obligations. The gentlemen of the negative would add a third. . . .

Turning to other forensic specimens, we may say that the Pi Kappa Delta national championship debates reported in this volume appear to suffer from that mechanistic clicking of arguments which results when speakers have debated many times on the same question with little infusion of fresh material. The double-length debate by the young ladies of Eureka College on Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws illustrates some of the faults of the thoroughgoing tight-case type. For example, the second affirmative speaker submits a skeleton draft for a national marriage

and divorce law, with three main headings and eighteen sub-headings (some of which require five sub-divisions); almost any one of the sub-headings calls for as much controversy as the question of the evening. The excellent speeches of Miss Dorothy Warner are bright spots in this debate.

If regional comparisons are allowable, the Pacific Coast comes off excellently; for the debate upon Japanese Exclusion furnished by students of the University of California at Los Angeles is one of the best in the book, and that between students of the California Institute of Technology and those of the University of British Columbia, except for a weak opening speech, is another. The first affirmative speaker representing the University of Redlands in the debate upon Restriction of the Supreme Court gives excellent illustrations of the persuasive use of authority.

This volume has the usual bibliographies, and in addition contains a valuable topical index to the first seven volumes of the series. Perhaps some previous editor has answered this question: Why are the speeches of each side in a debate printed in series, so that one must turn back and forth to read the speeches in the order of delivery?

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

Debating as an Educator. By JOHN G. SIMS, JR. Published by the author, Box 652, Fort Worth, Texas, 1926: pp. 112.

It would be quite possible to write a devastating review of this book; if the reviewer were young and cocksure it would be impossible to do anything else. Mr. Sims conducts his education in public—but in a day when kissing and telling is the stock-in-trade of many an esteemed author, this must be rated least of his offenses. Continual references to his larger work, *An Outline for Self Education*, bother the reader and make this book seem to be an advertising pamphlet for the other. But if one disregards these difficulties, and wades through anecdotes of Mr. Sims and the Fundamentalists, Mr. Sims and the Ku Klux Klan, Mr. and Mrs. Sims and the department store, as well as worthier material here set forth, one cannot escape the conclusion that the author has the root of the matter in him, and has every right to discuss the subject he sets himself.

The fact is that Mr. Sims is a two-handed, bare-fisted worker

and fighter in the field of dialectic; and his account of the business has raciness and vigor which come from hard-earned command of his subject. He has worked from the ground up. Beginning with a precept recalled from reading "Baker's *Argumentation*" twenty-five years ago, together with his own experiences as a debater and a teacher of debating, he arrives at a technique of constructive thinking, a theory of education, and very nearly a whole philosophy of life. The "right kind of debating," he finds, will help one in any of life's difficulties. In a foot-note which informs us that his "experience and observing in the harvesting of hay goes into several different states," he concludes, "I am convinced that the practice of *focusing* given by debating would be valuable to any farmer in hay-making."

The following passage fairly represents Mr. Sim's quality:

> . . . I have, for nearly twenty years, been trying to build up a private school in a Western city. Let us think of me as maintaining the affirmative of the proposition, Resolved, that my town should patronize my school liberally. Hastening over all the analyzing that is required in solving the problems involved, my task is threefold. First, I must make my school good enough to be worth patronizing. Second, I must acquaint myself with the viewpoints of the parents of my town. Third, I must make my advertising educate these parents into appreciating my school.
>
> Which of the three parts of my task is debating? The superficial will reply, The third. I doubt the third's being two per cent. of my task. Off hand, I should say that the first is ninety per cent. of the debate, that the second is eight per cent., and that the third is two per cent. Of course the real truth is that each of the three is a hundred per cent. of my task in the sense that all are necessary; but the point that I want to drive home is that making my school a better school and posting myself on the viewpoints of parents is debating, just as inventing better telescopes would be debating if I were maintaining that Mars is inhabited.

In spite of the excellent chapter (entitled "The Joker in the Pack") which treats of the frailties of human nature which make ineffective the best logic of the debater, one has the feeling that Mr. Sims expects too much rationality from his fellow-creatures; and that he makes himself something of a nuisance by being too often in the right. One can sympathize with the five-year-old boy who said to Mr. Sims, "Don't talk!" The boy was in the wrong, and Mr. Sims was in the right—and insisted upon proving his case. Has our author ever heard the suggestion that about the poorest use

one can make of a fellow-man is to refute him? At any rate Mr. Sims has the courage of his rationality, and has paid the price for these excellent qualities:

A school board were discussing the advisability of making it against the law for teachers to smoke, drink, dance, play cards, or go to theaters. I arose and seriously commended the proposed legislation and moved an amendment that any person doing these things also be forbidden to become a parent, as parents' examples are more influential on children's lives than are teachers.' I don't yet know why I was run out of town.

Surely getting acquainted with a debater of this stamp, whose words are *things* rather than just words, is worth far more than the seventy-five cents which this book costs (in paper; in boards, a dollar and a half; in either case, postpaid.)

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

Four Speeches by Abraham Lincoln Hitherto Unpublished or Unknown. With an introduction by EARL WELLINGTON WILEY, The Ohio State University Press, 1927: pp. 112.

Never-failing interest in Lincolniana gave Professor Wiley's recent contribution wider publicity than most scholarly productions receive. The printing of four "new" Lincoln speeches, new in the sense that they were hitherto unpublished or unknown, was bound to attract considerable attention from the press. But of greater interest to Professor Wiley's colleagues is the addition he has made to the criticism of Lincoln's oratory. Perhaps those who are studying in this field have been less prone than others to indiscriminate adulation, but if there has been a tendency toward an uncritical mood in tracing the development of the Emancipator as a master of public address, this brochure should furnish the antidote. For the introduction, which traces his speaking career from the campaign of 1832 to Cooper Union, clearly shows that in his earlier days he used, as a matter of course, the tactics of the virulent partisan. "To quibble, to strain the truth of logic, to practice invective, to descend below the level of good taste were all accepted methods among the old school of stump speakers, as germane to the political art which Lincoln practiced on the platform in his growing years as they were foreign to the art which he practiced in his public speaking in his later years."

Evidence of Lincoln's earlier method is produced in the Scott

Club speech, Springfield, August 24, 1852. This was printed in full in the *Illinois Weekly Journal* of September 22, 1852, and also in the *Illinois Daily Journal.* Although Professor Wiley found evidence in the form of marginal notes that this speech had been read by historians and casual readers, it has, it is believed, not before been reprinted. Yet "to the Lincoln of 1852, that speech exemplified the art of the political speaker which he had practiced and cultivated for twenty years. It epitomizes the accepted glories of that art in much the same fashion as does the harangue in which he execrated Lewis Cass on the floor of the House, in 1848. The speeches are of a kind; and it is a little difficult to reconcile the fact that the latter has been highly commended and that the former has been suppressed. Like the Cass speech, the Scott Club argument characterizes the mind and speaking art which Lincoln accepted as a model, in 1852. And, understood correctly, there is nothing in it that mars the memory of its revered author a farthing: for the speech typifies a manner of speaking which Lincoln was to transcend."

The speech itself, a broad, at times bitter invective against Pierce, McClernand and particularly Douglas, employing all of the devices of the partisan stump speaker, and marked at times by sallies of burlesque and *reductio ad absurdum*, supports Professor Wiley's comments. Even in this early speech, however, which in content and style is more inferior to the poorest of the debate speeches of 1858 than those are inferior to the Cooper Union address, is to be found a keen reasoning and power of analysis which suggest the Lincoln of tradition. As a document showing Lincoln at this stage of development, the Scott Club speech should be studied along with the Cass invective.

A significant fragment from the time midway between the Scott Club speech and the Second Inaugural is "The Apple of Gold Speech." This, the manuscript of which is in the possession of the Gunther Collection, was probably written between the end of October, 1858, and the first of February, 1861. In thought and expression it suggests the Gettysburg address. No *ad hominen* here, but lofty thinking on the theme that "all men are created equal." Whether or not it was ever delivered as a speech, it is of importance as marking a stage in the evolution of Lincoln's political attitude.

Scholars interested in the political issues of the campaigns of 1858 and 1860 have long been cognizant of the fact that the mighty Cooper Union argument on the point that the statesmen of the Revolution "understood that no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories" was the result, not of preparation for one speech, but of protracted public discussion. The issue, first raised in 1854, had come to a definite head in the campaign of 1858, and even in that campaign one can trace a definite evolution of Lincoln's argument on the point. But, as Professor Wiley points out, both Lincoln and Douglas rested on circumstantial evidence in that year. Likewise in 1859, Douglas' essay on the subject in *Harper's* and Lincoln's speeches at Columbus and Cincinnati failed to use direct proof.

To this interesting problem Professor Wiley contributes two newly-discovered newspaper reports of speeches given in 1859, the Indianapolis speech of September 19 and the Leavenworth speech of December 5. Both of these show an advance from the circumstantial reasoning of 1858 toward the documented and direct argument of Cooper Union. They serve as an indication that Lincoln was dissatisfied with the proof he had adduced during the debates with Douglas, and realized that the actual deeds and utterances of the Founders alone would suffice. From Kansas "Lincoln returned to Springfield. One opportunity to discover the necessary facts to demonstrate the proposition lay before him, for twelve weeks later he was scheduled to speak from the pulpit of Henry Ward Beecher's Plymouth Church, in Brooklyn. That he spent hours and hours in the library of the old State House in Springfield is certain, and when the day dawned that he should entrain for the East he was ready. In his pocket he carried a manuscript copy of the Cooper Union argument. . . . " Read in connection with the scholarly and well-documented introduction, these reports of two speeches of the autumn of 1859 are worthy the closest attention of those interested in tracing the genesis of one of our greatest American deliberative speeches.

That Professor Wiley's decade of research into the speaking career of Lincoln has produced this contribution should be welcome news indeed. That further interesting and valuable material is

forthcoming from this source is, the reviewer thinks, probable. In my opinion, we need more of this historical and rhetorical criticism. It is a field that we have not too intensively cultivated.

W. P. SANDFORD, *University of Illinois*

An Introduction to the Drama. Edited by J. B. HUBBELL and J. O. BEATTY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

This anthology contains nineteen longer plays beginning with the *Antigone* of Sophocles and ending with Eugene O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*, and nine one-act plays, including such dramatic club favorites as *Riders to the Sea*, *A Night at an Inn*, and *Overtones*. In the preface to each of the nine divisions of the book the editors, adhering to the principle that a "printed play is not a play at all until it is acted," discuss the theatres, acting, and actors of various periods, and their influence upon the drama.

In college courses in play-production a collection of plays is usually assigned to the class for practice in coaching and acting, and also for practice in designing models and ground-plans, in "blocking out the action," and in constructing prompt-books. For such work the present anthology is free from the limitations evident in a collection of plays of a single type, period, or author.

The bibliography suggests at least eighteen works particularly relevant to play-production.

ROSS SCANLAN, *Washington University*

Talking. By J. B. PRIESTLEY. New York: Harper & Bros., 1926.

An Essay on Conversation. By HENRY W. TAFT. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Conversation. By OLIVE HESELTINE. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927.

There are at least two distinct points of view from which the reader may approach these three new books on conversation. He may be looking merely for entertainment seasoned with not too much instruction, or he may be searching for a true concept of conversation and an accurate account of its history. If he assumes the first attitude, he will not be disappointed. Mr. Priestley, particularly, has a delightful style that at times arouses echoes of Lamb; he sets up a concept of talk that is hopelessly ideal and therefore exactly suited to his impressionistic treatment; he writes

entertainly, if sometimes inaccurately, about Dr. Johnson, Coleridge, Macaulay, Oscar Wilde, Mackintosh, and other "lecturers"; and he admits at the end that he has never heard such talk as he yearns for, and probably never will hear it on earth. The book has charm.

Mr. Taft's essay, inspired, he says, by that of Mr. Priestley, lacks much of this charm of style and treatment. The concept of conversation here set forth is not offered simply as a personal ideal; Mr. Taft, a lawyer, has a tendency to be judicial in his criticism. "Good conversation," he says, "is not prearranged or formal; it is generally upon indifferent matters, and is always participated in by all of a company." Anticipating criticism, he becomes a bit irritated. "If this conception of the social phenomenon is not correct, it will at least sufficiently describe what we are dealing with," says he. Now the true impressionist cares not at all for criticism. He says his say, and that is the end of it. The reader may take it or leave it. Hence Mr. Taft's essay, along with the book of Miss Heseltine, who was manifestly trying to write a history of conversation, may be considered judicial in tone; and both may justly be criticized, therefore, on that basis.

Mr. Taft, like Mr. Priestley, rules out Dr. Johnson: "He had not any inclination for what we are now attempting to describe as conversation." He dismisses Coleridge by calling him a lecturer; he utterly ignores Oscar Wilde. Dr. Johnson, of course, had little inclination to talk on "indifferent matters;" he was too intelligent for that. But he did relish the give and take of conversation. He did not "dread" Burke because he was a worthy antagonist; he *liked* him for that reason. Mr. Taft falls into the common error of supposing that because Boswell failed to record what they said, Johnson's friends did little talking. Boswell was writing a biography of Johnson, not of Burke or of Sir Joshua Reynolds. Naturally he included just so much of the talk of others as was necessary to explain the words of Johnson. If complete records of everything said in Johnson's presence were the extant, the weakness of Mr. Taft's criticism would be evident. Much the same is true concerning Coleridge. But regardless of all this, it seems obvious that a definition of conversation that excludes all the great conversationalists is *ipso facto* too narrow. It is interesting to note that after discarding all the great talkers, Mr. Taft eulogizes Gen-

eral Grant because he once heard him tell a good story. As a piece of judicial criticism, therefore, this essay has glaring defects; nevertheless it is at times highly entertaining and informative. The writer has an extended acquaintance with former works on conversation, and offers a number of excellent quotations from Epictitus, Seneca, Bacon, Swift, Montaigne, Johnson, Chesterfield, Franklin, Stevenson, and others.

Miss Heseltine, too, has gathered a wealth of information. But like Mr. Taft, she has no valid standards of judgment. In her attempt to trace the history of conversation from the middle ages to the present, she fails to distinguish between oral and written conversation; she keeps, in the main, to a discussion of English talkers, but jumps to France or Germany whenever the spirit moves her; she mixes writers on conversation with conversationalists at random, and even commits the unpardonable sin of assuming that because a man wrote well about talk he was a good talker. She calls Addison "easy, spontaneous, gracious," on the premise that his conversation may be judged by his essays, when Lord Chesterfield says definitely that in company Addison was timid and awkward. Furthermore, she lacks a criterion of emphasis. She gives little more than a page to Coleridge and fifteen to Napoleon; she gives two paragraphs to Oscar Wilde and ten pages to Thomas Carlyle. And intermixed with all this is a continuous flow of digressions on customs, historical events, life as depicted in novels, literary movements, court intrigues, and the like. Out of this welter of interesting material someone, perhaps, will someday cull those portions that belong in a book on talk, supplement them with other material necessary to give historical perspective, and produce a readable and judicial history of conversation. But nearly all the work will have to be done over again, because Miss Heseltine has not deigned to give a bibliography.

To sum up: all three, Mr. Priestley, Mr. Taft, and Miss Heseltine, are at heart impressionists; all have individual concepts of conversation, no two of which are alike; all have information; all write entertainly, though in varying degrees. The reader looking for books that are interesting and mildly instructive will relish their works. But the reader looking for a workable definition of conversation and a discriminating historical survey will be disappointed. This second reader will readily pardon Mr. Priestley,

who does not pretend to be a judge or a scholar; he cannot pardon Mr. Taft so easily, nor can he help wishing that Miss Heseltine had been less anxious to print everything she knew.

RAYMOND F. HOWES, *Washington University*

The Road to Xanadu. By JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927: pp. xviii, 639.

The Function and Forms of Thought. By ALBERT E. AVEY. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1927: pp. xii, 395.

Neither of the books here noted would be classified in any publisher's catalogue under Speech or Public Speaking; neither lies within the field. Yet each, discovered on its edges, has something of value to contribute—stimulating suggestion or raw material for the fence-climbing and the taking.

Professor Lowes' *The Road to Xanadu* is sub-titled "A Study in the Ways of the Imagination." That those ways are shown by means of a critical background study and analysis of Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* is incidental; the poems are simply the materials through which the creative process is made evident. To trace the elements of a work of creative genius back to the chaos from which the whole, somehow, came, to note the magic blending in "the deep well of unconscious cerebration," the function of the Shaping Spirit, and of the Will which changes revery to art—this was the task. And more than this: having the facts, from them were drawn, with close and glowing logic, their implications in relation to the general process of creative endeavor. Dr. Lowes has tracked the creative energy back, very far back, to find in the end a mystery still, but to give along the intricate, fascinating way more clear light than has ever before been shed upon the necessary elements and stages of the creative process.

Many things are made evident, this among them: that the notion of the creative imagination as having little or nothing to do with facts is utterly groundless—"the magic plays, like strange light over a familiar landscape, upon a groundwork of fact." But not simply upon fact amassed with conscious relevance to the particular piece of creative work. Far below, in the subsoil of conscious material, is "the wonderworking well." Many are familiar with it from the psychological works of James and Stout, but never has its alchemy been so vividly or minutely shown nor its relation

to the two stages of conscious effort between which it is the "intermundium"—the Well must first be filled with the mass of materials over which the Shaping Spirit moves and, when sleeping images are called to consciousness again at a touch, a controlling Will must "curb and rudder" them; thinking must be dominantly present to transform a flowing revery into a patterned work of art.

These are shown as the ways of the poetic imagination. But Dr. Lowes early stresses the fact that the creative process, thrown into relief by a study of poetry, is not its monopoly. Chaos, with the miracle of transmutation and association; the flash of vision, poetical, mathematical, as Poincaré clearly shows it, scientific in the form of the hypothesis; the period of conscious willing and shaping —these are general elements. And upon them, for any field, the work throws light. For each there are inevitable differences, and a fascinating research problem lies ahead in resolving them for rhetoric and speech, in tracing specifically for the field the implications of the theory. An advance guess is hazarded that the differences lie mainly in the final phase of the development. Naturally none of the differential work for speech is done in *The Road to Xanadu*, although Dr. Lowes is frequently on the middle ground held in common by it and poetry as, outstandingly, in his unforgettable "Sea-Change" chapter, a study of diction in terms of "sleeping words," their "winnowing and blending" and their waking: "Give Coleridge one vivid word from an old narrative; let him mix it with two in his thought; and then—'out of three sounds he will form, not a fourth sound but a star.'"

To the reviewer the study as a whole has proved widely suggestive in relation to speech work. To trace the by-paths to which it allured is not within the scope of a review. Certainly it cast light upon the question of the hinterlands of extemporaneous speaking and the matter of speech preparation in general; its implications clearly pointed the way toward genuinely creative achievement as over against a collection-selection-repetition, a "joiner's-work," product.

Not within the field, this work of literary criticism, yet with more to contribute to it than any book the reviewer has been fortunate enough to delve into in many and many a month.

The Function and Forms of Thought is—another logic text!

Those familiar with the field will know that there were already many, yet Professor Avey has made a contribution of value to those interested in argumentation, although his type of approach has taken him for half the work much further than usual from the applications of logic. For the rest, however, it has brought him very near, at times directly into, them. Symbolic logic is the *n*th degree of non-application and the work is sub-titled "logic based upon symbolic principles." Justifying this, Chapters IX-XXV are given over to a simple presentation of logic in terms of symbols. These are not recommended to the student of speech unless he chances to be also a student of logic as such. The rest of the book —the first eight chapters and the last five—is another matter.

The first group gives a rapid, clear, largely non-technical treatment of such matters as the process of proof, the establishment of the specific case, etc., in the author's words it aims to present an "interpretation of the process of thinking in relation to the other interests of life." The chapter on proof ends with a discussion of the "burden of proof" of argumentation and debate. Following the section on symbolic logic Professor Avey turns to a chapter on fallacies done in terms of argument and to "Applied Logic," a view of the subject from the standpoint of other fields. An excellent presentation of the characteristics of good thinking passes over into a specific study, "Analysis of Argument." All in all, in its non-symbolic parts, the work is a peculiarly rewarding one for the teacher of argumentation. Some of the exercises will be found of interest. For example, for fallacies Professor Avey draws now and then from such a current and inexhaustible source as the works of Bruce Barton.

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM, *Los Angeles*

Demosthenes and His Influence. By CHARLES DARWIN ADAMS. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927: pp. 184. $1.75.

Les idées politiques d'Isocrate. By GEORGES MATHIEU. Paris: Société d'éditions *Les Belles Lettres*, 1925: pp. 228.

Integrity in Education and Other Papers. By GEORGE NORLIN. New York: Macmillan, 1926: pp. vi, 231.

When Mitford's *History of Greece* laid the political misfortunes of the city-states to the rise of democracy, George Grote felt he could best serve the cause of English liberalism by writing

another history of Greece. Demosthenes naturally fared differently in the two accounts. Towards the close of the nineteenth century German scholars began to see an analogy between the powerlessness of the Greek city-states before Philip, and the helplessness of the German states before their unification by the Prussian rulers. They discovered in the pan-Hellenism of Isocrates a prototype for pan-Germanism, and began to see in Frederick the Great and Wilhelm I another Philip of Macedon. In 1916 Engelbert Drerup, in *Aus einer alten Advokatenrepublik* presented Demosthenes as a self-seeking demagogue, the forerunner of such modern politicians as Asquith, Lloyd-George, and Henri Poincaré. After the war, Georges Clemenceau paid tribute to Demosthenes as the ancient guardian of freedom and democracy whose spirit must continue to animate all free peoples. Naturally Isocrates, too, has been exalted or contemned according to the argumentative purposes of the writers who have discussed him. For many generations of scholars and critics he has been an insufferable egotist who dared to think his own ideas as truly "philosophical" as those of Plato, or a would-be political orator who was too deficient in Demosthenic fire, courage, and patriotism to be effective. He has been merely another schoolmaster who demonstrated his pedagogical limitations whenever he turned his attention from the routine of the schoolroom to the realm of ideas or affairs. De Quincey said that Isocrates was merely the bar of a dumbbell, connecting two galaxies of Greek genius, and significant chiefly because he lived so long. But now the pedagogy of Isocrates is being studied anew, his statesmanship is said by many to have been far-sighted and patriotic, as well as more practical than that of Demosthenes, and there are those who allow him some title to wisdom even in the day of Plato and Aristotle.

Professor Adams, in his interesting summary of the career and influence of Demosthenes, weighs well the question of the wisdom of the orator's public policy. He admits that a union of the Greek states was the need of the time, and that even a forced union under a monarch might have been advantageous had the monarch been a representative of the best Greek traditions. But what happened later under Philip, Professor Adams believes, amply justified the fears of Demosthenes; if there was any failure

of vision, it was the failure to see the depths of ruin into which Philip's supremacy was to plunge Athens.

In discussing the oratory of Demosthenes, Professor Adams is able to base his judgments upon a wide knowledge of the rhetorical theory and oratorical practise of the period, and of course, upon an intimate knowledge of the orations of Demosthenes. He is quite willing to concede that Demosthenes was often overshrewd, inclined to draw conclusions so far-fetched as to arouse the suspicions of the hearers, apt to cover weaknesses in his argument by rushing into furious personal assaults, that he was too stern and intense for humor, and was generally censorious. He cites John Quincy Adam's criticism of Demosthenes, "there is nothing like learning in these orations. There is nothing that discovers a cultivated mind. There is little of philosophy, no indulgence to the imagination, no wit or humor, no attempt at ridicule; he is sufficiently figurative, but all his figures are taken from familiar objects. His eloquence is characteristic of democracy, as that of Cicero is of aristocracy." Lord Brougham, whom Professor Adams also cites as a critic, was, after all, an orator pronouncing an oration upon oratory, and his praises of Demosthenes should not be taken too seriously as criticism.

In the section upon the influence of Demosthenes in classical antiquity, we are given the opinions of Cicero, Dionysius, Quintilian, Hermogenes, and their successors. Cicero has been the dominant influence in British oratory, and as Americans have taken English orators for their models, we find Ciceronian influence much stronger than the Demosthenic in our own tradition. Professor Adams closes his survey of English and American oratory with a warning against the neglect of Demosthenes.

> English and American oratory since the middle of the nineteenth century has been less affected by classical models. The simplicity of style in all prose writing and the contempt for everything 'rhetorical' have greatly improved public speaking. But there is a serious danger lest with the elimination of the artificial elements of oratory we lose the essential elements of force and of appeal to the emotions. A speech is not an essay, and it has its own laws of power and effectiveness. No greater service could be done toward the recovery of the influence of the spoken word both in England and America than by a revival of the study of the Greek

masterpieces. The relegation of the study of Demosthenes to the closets of classical philology has been a disaster to the cause of effective oratory.

In *Les idées politiques d'Isocrate,* by George Mathieu, we have a scholarly and unbiassed examination of Athenian political life and thought in relation to the political theories of Isocrates, an account of Isocrates' search for a leader to carry out his plans for an Athenian hegemony, of his turning to Philip, and of the final Athenian defeat. There are excellent discussions of the relations between Isocrates and the philosophers, the political orators, and the historians of the time. We usually have the public policies of Demosthenes and Isocrates contrasted, but Mathieu shows that they had much in common; their difference was over the trustworthiness of Philip as a means to an end desired by both, namely, Greek unity. Demosthenes, Hyperides, and the other Greek orators took many of their ideas from Isocrates, as did the historians who were trained by him. While Mathieu does not take the extreme point of view of some of the modern Germans, he does make it clear that Isocrates wielded a very considerable influence upon the thought and action of his time, and that the older accounts have very greatly underestimated the man.

George Norlin, President of the University of Colorado, seems to be a rare spirit who refuses to sink the scholar in the executive. Volume one of his translation of the speeches of Isocrates for the Loeb Classical Library is now on the press. He includes his introduction to this volume, slightly abridged, among the essays in a collection entitled *Integrity in Education and other Papers.* In something less than forty pages we have an admirably condensed account of the more significant aspects of the career and influence of Isocrates. President Norlin takes about the same view of Isocrates' political influence as Mathieu and is generally much more sympathetic in his treatment than the older critics. Isocrates has often been abused for patiently polishing his periods, but President Norlin remarks that he made the artificial prose of Gorgias artistic, and in so doing he fixed the form of rhetorical prose for the Greek world, and through the influence of Cicero, for modern times as well. Many scholars have ridiculed Isocrates for his pretentiousness in calling himself a philosopher, but it is here very justly pointed out that in so doing Isocrates was taking

to himself a title which was very much more modest than that of sophist—the title of philosopher had at that time no definite association with speculative or abstract thought, but implied only a lover of wisdom or a seeker after the cultivated life. The cultural and educational ideals of Isocrates are set forth both in the study we have been discussing, *That Old Man Eloquent*, and in the title essay, *Integrity in Education*, where the ancient sophist's definition of an educated man serves as a text for an attack upon the evils of overspecialization.

EVERETT HUNT, *Swarthmore College*

Spoken Thought. By LILY C. WHITAKER. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1927: pp. x + 596.

There is no use in saying a word about this voluminous "textbook on vocal expression for use in high schools, normal schools and colleges" unless one is prepared to say something about the kind of book, the kind of teaching, and the school of thought which it represents. The only word which seems to cover these is "mystical"—though no prejudice to the word is intended by this use. It is the kind of book which has as motto on its title-page, quoted from an author unnamed, "Thought is immortal; expression is the voice of Thought." A capricious use of capitals and of quotation marks is peculiar to the mystical school. In this book the words "spoken thought" are capitalized and put in quotation marks almost every time they are used. Why? Presumably spoken thought is a very real and important thing; why suggest that these words constitute an expression to be uttered with a hushing and mellowing of the voice, like "that blessed word, Mesopotamia"? Here is another specimen:

The inspiration of the "Life of Christ" has converted millions to the religion of love.

So far as the context shows, no book of this title is meant, but rather the life that Christ lived. Why not say so?

This is also the kind of book wherein one reads:

The simple melody of the untrained human voice singing in the fields, the patter of little feet on the floor, the sublime music of the "silver-toned orator" all lift our hearts and make us love nature in the epitome of God's work—Man.

Or again:

The new-born enthusiasm of the Grecian patriot lifted high the standard of oratory over the classic walls of the Parthenon where the stuttering, stammering boy blossomed into the king of oratory,—Demosthenes, and the response has echoed down the high-road of time, even until to-day. It lifted its touch [presumably its torch] against tyranny in the Roman Forum; flamed out in irresistible power on Bosworth Field and in the English House of Commons, and with a mighty bound crossed the great Atlantic where it stamped freedom on the flag of America.

Among the questions at the end of a chapter on oratory are these:

1. Define oratory.
2. What is its age?

Looking back in the chapter, the reader finds as an answer to the second question:

It may be said that oratory is the oldest of the arts, for before God painted the trees and wild flowers, before He tuned the throats of the forest choirs, before He raised the gigantic mountains or smoothed the grass-covered valleys He addressed a spoken thought to chaos when He said, "Let there be light!"

These passages suggest other characteristics of the mystical school,—notably, fuzziness and inaccuracy in thinking, and a willingness to let sweetness prevail over light. Whatever the kind of training represented by this book may do, it does not sufficiently form the taste to prevent the author's including many of her own poems in groups of selections along with poems by Shakespeare, Tennyson, and Byron. Yet the author's poems are a little better, if anything, than those she includes from such authors as H. Waithman, Mary E. Ireland, M. B. N., Emma Playter Seabury, Anon., Unknown, and Unidentified. Anon. and Unknown are drawn upon very heavily; but in spite of this fact, many selections are printed without even so much of a signature. Why not give Elijah Kellogg credit for "Spartacus to the Gladiators"? The poem on p. 283, which should be called "Caliban in the Coal Mines," is Louis Untermeyer's. On p. 219 Anon. gets the credit for a passage from Edgar Lee Masters' "Silence." Two quotations on p. 86 are assigned to the authorship of King Arthur himself. A certain number of proof errors can be forgiven—such, perhaps, as printing Caleb Young Rice for Cale Young Rice and Mary Caroline Davies for Mary Carolyn Davies; but it *is* too bad that Rienzi is made to open his address to the Romans with the sentence, "I come here to talk," thereby robbing him of a stock oratorical device. Surely

the publishers could have corrected "De Cerventes," seeing that a better form is used elsewhere in the book; and why have John Harrington cited as the author of one selection and Jno. Harrington of another? Why the jocularity of Alf Kreymborg? Dryden's "Song for St. Cecilia's Day" is reprinted entire and attributed to Pope. The song from *The Lady of the Lake,* "Hail to the chief who in triumph advances," is attributed to Campbell. Pope is misquoted on p. 212; Henry Van Dyke on p. 270; and Shakespeare on p. 471. Printing the word "lessened' for "lessoned" in the fortieth line of "My Last Duchess" is an especially subtle and confusing error.

Let it be said that the school of teaching here being discussed is not without very real claims to our regard. One can love a bit of poetry and can express its values (or some of them) without knowing its author or the date of its composition. And there is indeed something to be wondered at, with perpetual admiration, in the gift of speech, in the embodiment of thought in words. Hiram Corson and S. S. Curry probably must be classed as belonging to the mystical school; they were not afraid to talk about spiritual values in speaking and reading. Yet something has happened to the doctrine of these great men if books like this one can appear in the same tradition. Somebody has failed—and probably all of us who ever have caused a reluctant school-boy to recite "Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll!" must share the blame—if, within the past twelvemonth, an American publisher could put out as a text-book in the field of vocal expression a work which raises questions of taste and of elementary scholarship on almost every page, which definitely gives the impression that spoken thought is vague and sentimental thought, and which is in general the sort of book one wishes one's enemy had written.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

Training for Speaking. By PAUL BERTON. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1926.

"The aim of this book is to place concisely and clearly before the student a combination of the very successful methods and principles of teaching of the French Conservatoire and the chief Italian school, which have been the basis of the Author's own teaching for many years, and which are now published for the first time.

"The Author thoroughly explains the physiology of the breathing organism in relation to speaking, and provides practical illustrations and exercises to enable the student to understand and control proper breathing, correct enunciation, articulation, diction, and declamation, together with gesture, all of which are absolutely essential to the art of speaking."

Much valuable material as regards voice production and gesture is given to fulfill the aim of this book, material which would enable a student (if he thoroughly understands and intelligently applies the principles set forth) to improve and free his voice and body—a result which is essential in speech education. Not infrequently has ridicule been heaped upon this matter of mastering the technique of speech, but it is just about the kind of stumbling-block to the speaker that an axe is to the woodsman; he may cut himself with it, but he will not accomplish much without it. Too many depend upon what they choose to call inspiration, but is inspiration a substitute for technical mastery, or is it a result of such mastery? A great deal that is fundamental is found in Mr. Berton's book, but I doubt the wisdom of the method set forth in chapters two and three, respectively entitled "Dissection" and "Interpretation." "It is indispensable for the teacher to be thoroughly conversant with the rules of grammar, syntax, phonetics, rhetoric and logic," says Mr. Berton, and surely no one will deny this; but, says Mr. Berton, let the punctuation marks ?, !, —, " ", or () equal the period of four beats, then the relative value of other marks of grammatical punctuation will be as follows:

. = 4 beats
: = 3 beats
; = 2 beats
, = 1 beat

Would not this method of *putting more ink in the eye of the student* tend to increase his difficulties and make him mechanical? A great many read the punctuation marks as so much *ink*, and would not this method make the matter of commas, colons, semicolons and periods the chief objective? Surely the real objective is accomplished when the student learns, as Stanislavsky says, "not to put a spot in the eye or a noise in the ear but an *idea* in the mind of the audience."

DONALD WHEELER, *Princeton University*

Stammering and Its Treatment. By SAMUEL D. ROBBINS. Boston: Boston Stammerers' Institute, 1926; 12 mo, Cloth; pp. 121.

The *Foreword* states: "This handbook is published . . . to supplement the course of private lessons for the correction of stammering offered by the Boston Stammerers' Institute. . . . The mere reading of this book will not correct any case of stammering, but daily, conscientious application of instructions contained herein *should prove just as helpful as any correspondence course,* and *should materially shorten the time one will need to remain at the Boston Stammerers' Institute.*" (Italics mine.) This last thought is a frequently recurring refrain. It not only gives the real purpose of the book, but suggests also its true value.

G. B. MUCHMORE, *Cornell University*

Our Times. Volume II, America Finding Herself. By MARK SULLIVAN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1927.

This book is not, of course, in "our field," but Chapter VI, "The American Mind: Eloquence, or at Least Elocution," deals with the Delsarte movement and with the teaching of elocution in schools during the 1890's or thereabouts; selected excerpts and pictures from text-books enliven the account. Mr. Sullivan puts his tale in the past tense, as if everything of which he speaks had been given up, and he does scant justice to extremes of elocutionary doctrine. One is inclined to say, "You don't know the half of it."

Chapter II, "The American Mind: Education," emphasizes the moulding effect of school readers, and especially of the series known as McGuffey's. For a teacher of reading the moral is plain that the choice of selections does make a difference. Casual notes throughout the book enforce the influence of speeches and speakers: the oratory of Charles M. Schwab was important in the formation of the United States Steel Corporation; the oratory of Harvey W. Wiley helped make possible the Pure Food and Drugs Act; and so on.

H. H. H., *Princeton University*

IN THE PERIODICALS

[Material for this department should be sent to A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa. Short reviews of important articles, notices of new publications of interest to our readers, lists of articles or single items of possible interest will be welcomed.]

NEVINSON, H. W., *How to Speak Poetry.* Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 140, December, 1927, pp. 819 ff.

The person who expects to find in this article suggestions as to methods of acquiring skill in the speaking of poetry will be disappointed. Not even will he find a pedagogical setting down of rules or principles upon which approved recitation of poetry should be based. He will find, however, as part of a general explanation of the Oxford Poetry Speaking Contest, a clear statement of the skills necessary for the correct vocal rendition of verse. Mr. Nevinson first explains that the object of the contest is "to create or maintain a fine tradition of speaking English verse." He then mentions the names of the judges (all of whom are literary persons of note); explains how the contests are planned and executed; the standards upon which the competitors are judged; the comparative skill with which the poetry is spoken; and the enthusiasm with which the contest is greeted by the University and the city.

In referring to the interest shown in these contests he uses such phrases as "attract large crowds," "excitement runs high," and explains: "Intense silence of enthusiasm prevails until the decision of the judges is given out. Then the cheers shake the building and the winners enjoy the happiest moment of their lives."

A few further quotations from the article might prove interesting to us in the light of certain discussions we have heard at the meetings of National Speech Convention. We are told that at the two earliest sessions "Many of the candidates thought to win approval by dramatic gestures and violent changes of voice or expression as though they were acting Hamlet or Lady Macbeth on

the stage, one woman falling down at the end of her recitation." But "since those earlier years gesture of any kind has pretty nearly disappeared. . . . The hands are kept quietly at the side or just clasped in front."

As to the standards upon which judgment is made, we are informed that "The judges seek for beauty of speech, but also for fineness of understanding." Mr. Nevinson, who always acts on the judging board, explains in this connection that it is often difficult to detect this fineness of understanding in the speaker with absolute certainty, and informs us that the wise judge refrains from looking at the contestants "especially when they are girls or young women."

ALICE W. MILLS

BEUICK, MARSHALL D., *The Limited Social Effect of Radio Broadcasting*. American Journal of Sociology, 32, 1927, 615-622.

There are about five million receiving sets in the United States, and perhaps twenty million "listeners-in" each night. Six hundred stations sent out programs of varying kinds; of these, twenty-four are at agricultural colleges, one hundred eight at educational institutions in general, forty-seven are maintained by churches, and thirty-nine by newspapers. (These figures are as of 1924.)

It was predicted that the radio would revolutionize our social consciousness, as printing was to do. But its greatest effect has been on rural inhabitants. The radio cannot supersede the theatre, the concert, variety hall or the lecture hall. The novelty has given the impetus to its advance, and not a "powerful stimulation of man's instincts or emotions."

Man is gregarious by nature. He likes to be among fellow human beings, to act in concert with them. Like attracts like, as has been observed in great migrations; e. g., the Mormons and the Puritans.

"Broadcasting has hardly any gregarious or association appeal. . . . Man cannot satisfy his desire for association with others of whom he is conscious of being the same kind; nor can he act in concert with other human beings through broadcasting. . . .

"There is no 'kick' in mailing applause to a favorite station, and it requires a tremendous exertion with the imagination to feel one's self a part of a broadcast audience."

"Broadcasting can never really stimulate a consciousness of kind." Its greatest service will be "to isolated persons like farmers, the sightless and those who are nearly deaf," or who are forced to remain indoors on account of the inclement weather.

G. W. G.

VAN BAGGEN, N. Y. POOCK, M. D., The Hague, Holland. *The Peripheric Expressive or Articular Speech Defects:* Med. Jour. and Record, Apr. 1927, p. 38.

Cleft-palate speech, although comparatively rare in college speech groups, appears frequently in city, school and medical clinics where speech defects are treated. Dr. Van Baggen's article on Cleft Palate Speech is well worth the attention of workers with this type of patient. The author refers to the psychic effects of the speech defect, and to the importance of attempting early methods of correction.

A short review of the history of treatment for cleft-palate is given, describing the mucuo-periosteal operation, the fibro-mucuous method, and the method by which the bony portions are approximated by use of silver wire. The use of obturators when other methods are unsuccessful is also mentioned. Speech training is advised as early as one month after the operation. Formal drill and exercises are of little use with small children. Here, one must resort to games and plays, and enlist the aid of nurse or mother, who must insist upon intelligible speech in the child, gradually training him in the elimination of excessive nasality. In cleft-palate speech one usually finds, according to this author, not merely excessive nasality on vowels and consonants, but a very breathy tone, omission of certain consonants and frequently a lisp. Breathing exercises are advocated as the first step in treatment, then follows the education of palatal muscles, improvement in the action of the pharyngeal muscles, training the constrictors of the pharynx in order that they may compensate for a short or missing uvula.

Exercises are given for improving the quality of vowel and consonant sounds, and a summary of results obtained by the author concludes the article. His results suggest a hopeful prognosis for other cases similarly treated. Dr. Van Baggen was usually able to secure speech which was intelligible, but not always could the nasality be entirely eliminated. He calls attention to the *hollow*

quality of tone due to the shape of the oral resonance chamber and nasal cavity, in cleft palatal cases, and claims that this too is difficult to entirely overcome. Perseverance and pluck on the part of the patient are necessary after all to the accomplishment of the most satisfactory results, whatever the method applied.

SARA M. STINCHFIELD, *Mount Holyoke College*

HIBSCHMAN, HARRY. *Do Chautauquans Think?* Plain Talk I, No. 2, pp. 51-56. November, 1927.

Mr. Hibschman bases this article on his observation of four hundred seventy-five audiences who listened to his lectures on "Are We Going Back to the Jungle?" and "Why We Behave like Human Beings." On the back of each program he placed a list of questions; members of the audience were requested, after the lecture, to ask those or any other questions they desired.

Careful tabulation of results shows that the leading question was "Can a man accept evolution and retain his religious faith?" Second in popularity was "What ails the youth of today?" Others of the first rank included "Is the Nordic the superior branch of the white race?" "Is the creedless church practicable?" "Is conscience a reliable guide?" "What are dreams?" Ninety-five percent of the audiences refused to ask any question containing an allusion to sex.

Mr. Hibschman's conclusion is that in general the mental horizon of the average person of today is woefully limited, but that in every community may be found a small group of independent thinkers fearlessly challenging old standards and working toward new ones.

To anyone faced with the problem of making a speech in New England, the middle Atlantic states, or the South, this delineation of the interests of the average audience should prove useful.

R. F. H.

BALDWIN, H. M. *English Phonetics for Foreign Students.* The English Journal, Vol. 16, pp. 632-641: October, 1927.

In many of our progressive foreign language departments the phonetic method of teaching foreign sounds is used as a short cut to the acquisition of the pronunciation of the language; phonetic training is considered an essential part of the teacher's equipment.

Our English departments, however, are concerned with teaching English literature and composition to native Americans in the vernacular and give little thought to the special needs of the foreign students in the classes. Yet the foreign student, who is attempting in spite of his language handicap, to keep up with the native Americans in his classes, needs to have the most expert help possible in the acquisition of this—to him—foreign language. He needs, even more than the American student of French, all the short cuts to the learning of the foreign language that the best modern methods can supply.

In his article Mr. Baldwin has offered suggestions for some short cuts in the teaching of English sounds to foreigners. To make his suggestions concrete, Mr. Baldwin has shown how they may be applied to the teaching of a Chinese student. The article should be especially helpful to the teacher who has little training in methods or little experience in teaching English to foreigners. The reader may not always approve Mr. Baldwin's standards of vowel production,—for instance, that the vowel in *hit* is normally a diphthong composed of the vowels in *he* and *but*. Nevertheless, if the foreigner follows the directions given and pronounces *hit—he-ut*—the word is likely to sound more nearly "American" than if a foreign vowel had been used.

I suppose after all the goal of the average foreign student is to learn to speak English with "American" rather than with foreign accent, and both teacher and pupil may feel satisfied if they approach fairly close to this goal. "He who speaks our language in our manner is by that token one of us."

SARAH T. BARROWS

PAGET, SIR RICHART, *The Invention of Human Speech*. Scientific American, Vol. 137: pp. 204-205, September, 1927.

In this article the author discusses the origins of human speech —its development from *phonation*, the language of the emotions, and *articulation*, the language of gesture. He shows how different speech sounds result from the changes in the resonators of the vocal mechanism; also how recognizable speech sounds may be produced artificially by constructing models which have the same number of cavities present, tuned to the same pitch, as the sound which is to be imitated. SARAH T. BARROWS

SAPIR, EDWARD: *Speech as a Personality Trait.* American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 32, 1927, 892-905.

"Speech is intuitively interpreted by normal human beings as an index of personal expression. . . . Its actual analysis, however, from this standpoint is difficult. . . . Several distinct strands may be detected in what looks at first sight like an integral phenomenon. . . . The social norm is always to be distinguished from the individual increment of expression, which is never discernible in itself, but only as measured against this norm. . . .Moreover, 'Speech' consists of at least five levels of behavior, the expressive value of any one of which need not be confirmed by all the others."

These levels, as given by the author, are (1) the voice itself, by which he means the general quality, the characteristics that set it off from the voices of others, and from other types of expressive behavior; (2) speech dynamics, which includes such variations as pitch changes, intensity changes, rate fluctuations; (3) the pronunciation, which differs for different individuals and for different localities; (4) the vocabulary, which is as variable as mankind, in that no two persons or no two groups have identical vocabularies, and also in that identical words have different meanings for different individuals; (5) the style of connected utterance, which of course varies with the social background, the training, the experiences of the different persons. "No one," he says, "has succeeded in giving a comprehensive account of what the voice is and what changes it may undergo." "Owing to the possibility of detecting conflict and other symptomatic reactions in speech, language behavior becomes a suggestive field for research in personality."

The obvious criticism of the article is that the author has not completed his analysis of the "levels of behavior" (sic) in speech. He would make speech purely a matter of the voice, whereas, in any references to speech as an indication of personality, one should give some thought at least to visual symbolization. Had the title been "Voice as a Personality Trait," the discussion would have been quite adequate, on the whole. With that reservation, the reviewer commends it to the atention of speech teachers as being very much worth while.

G. W. G. *University of Iowa*

HARGER, C. M., *The West Adopts Oratory*. Century, Vol. 115, No. 3, January, 1928, pp. 302-8.

Community service clubs throughout the West "with hundreds of thousands enrolled" are doing much to promote dinner speaking. "So widespread is this habit of oratory in the Interior that few towns of a thousand or more population are without at least one weekly visitation." This new type of oratory does not "include perorations. Flowers of rhetoric are mostly lacking. The quoting of poetry is at a discount."

The writer tries to explain the interest of the West in oratory, as illustrated not only by Kiwanian speeches but by the popularity of political oratory in the past, the Chautauqua platform, and evangelistic preaching. The West, he concludes, is attempting to express its material and other accomplishments. "The basis of oratory is the urge for speech—either statement of fact or elucidation of opinion." We suspect that the explanation of western oratory is somewhat more complicated than the article implies.

A. C. B.

ADAMS, WALTER H., *The Selection of the Proposition for Debate*. School Review, Vol. XXXV, No. 7, September, 1927, pp. 538-547.

The conclusions of this article based upon a questionnaire answered by 150 debate coaches throughout the country and upon another questionnaire filled out by "13 outstanding men in the field of argumentation and debate in the United States," are that for school debates (1) questions of policy should be preferred to those of fact or philosophical speculation; (2) local rather than state or national questions should be used.

"Schools should select the question. In most states the schools have little or nothing to do with choosing the proposition. So long as this practice continues, undesirable propositions will be debated. The practice will continue so long as state debating leagues exist for the apparent purpose of choosing a state champion in debate." In defense of a number of the state debating leagues, it should be said that the schools do have a very large part in the selection of the question, as in the Maine interscholastic debate league conducted by Bates College.

A. C. B.

NEWS AND NOTES

[Items intended for this department—play programs, announcements of new courses, changes in positions, programs of state and sectional meetings, and personals—should be sent directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 30 Clinton Street, Brooklyn. Normal School items will be received by Carroll P. Lahman, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Michigan.]

At the University of Iowa was held, January 19, 20, and 21, a Conference on Fine Arts and a Regional Drama Conference. All of the fine arts were represented, and about sixty guests outside the state were present, including George Pierce Baker of Yale University; B. Iden Payne, of Carnegie Institute of Technology; Frederic McConnell, Director of the Play House, Cleveland, Ohio; and Marion Tucker, of the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. Among the entertainments planned for the visitors was a special student production of Shaw's *Saint Joan* in the University Theatre. The programs of both conferences are given here:

JANUARY 20—MORNING

A Co-ordinated Program for the Fine Arts

Walter Albert Jessup, President, University of Iowa.

Edgar Gordon, Professor of Music, University of Wisconsin.

Charles W. Hawthorne, National Academy of Design, New York City.

George Pierce Baker, Director of the University Theatre, Yale University.

Noon Luncheon for the Regional Drama Conference Delegates
Iowa Union

AFTERNOON

The Fine Arts in Student Life

B. Iden Payne, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Department of Drama.

S. Marion Tucker, Professor of Drama, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute.

John S. Ankeney, Department of Art, University of Missouri.

Otto Kinkeldey, Director of Music, New York Public Library.

George Pullen Jackson, Director of Nashville Symphony Orchestra, Vanderbilt University.

5:00 P.M. Weekly Recital by Music Students

6:00 P.M. Dinner at the Iowa Union

Frederick P. Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation

8:00 P.M. Violin Recital, Renée Chemet

JANUARY 21—MORNING

The Fine Arts in Community Life

Lorado Taft, Sculptor, Chicago.

William W. Norton, Chairman, Civic Music Committee, Flint, Michigan.

Frederic McConnell, Director, The Play House, Cleveland, Ohio.

NOON

Luncheon for the Regional Drama Conference Delegates.

Selection of Plays and the Royalty Problem

Chairman, Mrs. Pearl Bennett Broxam.

Leaders of Discussion: Herbert L. Drake, R. C. Hunter, C. M. Wise.

AFTERNOON

Regional Drama Conference

Topics: *Stagecraft for Little Theatres*
Amateur Theatre Standards
Producing Original Plays

Leaders of Discussion: G. P. Baker, Carol M. Sax, Harold Ehrensberger, W. C. Troutman, C. L. Menser, Mrs. Manta Graham.

At the Cornell University Summer Session courses in Public Speaking and Speech Training will be conducted by Dr. H. A. Wichelns, G. B. Muchmore, and C. K. Thomas, while dramatic acactivities will be conducted by A. M. Drummond, A. L. Woehl, R. R. Dunham, and Bernard Lenrow of Cornell, in addition to Dr. M. T. Herrick of the University of Pittsburgh and Dr. W. H. Stainton of Dartmouth College. Special lectures on "The Field of Rhetoric" will be given by Everett L. Hunt of Swarthmore College, editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH.

At the February meeting of the Oral Arts Association of Southern California, at Los Angeles, Julia Cox of the Cumnock School of Expression talked on "The Principles of English Phonetics;" Elizabeth Keppie, of Pasadena Junior College, who spent last summer in study at Oxford, talked on "The Oxford Verse-Reading Contest and Verse-Reading as Taught in England;" Virginia Rowell reported on the Cincinnati Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

Newly elected officers of the Oral Arts Association are: President, Clara Weyer Getsinger, Le Conte Junior High School; First Vice-President, Edith Everett, Hollywood High School; Second Vice-President, J. Richard Bietry, George Washington High School; Treasurer, Geneva Glantz, Assistant Supervisor, Speech Correction Department of Los Angeles; Corresponding Secretary, Susan Looney, Lankershim High School; and Recording Secretary, Paul Klingerman, El Monte High School.

The State Teachers College of San Jose, California, has recently established an independent department of Speech Arts, headed by Virginia Sanderson.

The staff of the Department of Public Speaking of West Virginia University will include Professor Harry B. Gough of DePauw University for the entire period of twelve weeks of summer school. Professor Wilbur Jones Kay, head of the department, and Miss Constance Welch, instructor, will also teach during the first six weeks, and Mrs. Marja Steadman Fear will conduct courses in dramatics during the second term of six weeks.

The Public Speaking Department of Wabash College, under the chairman of W. N. Brigance, has changed its name to the Department of Speech, the new name to be effective next year.

One of the most active High-School Speech Departments in the country is that of Pontiac, Michigan, where, in addition to offering six academic courses, the department maintains its own completely equipped little theatre, an elaborate wardrobe equipment, a complete dramatic library, a miniature theatre built by the stu-

dents on the scale of an inch to a foot, a complete Punch and Judy show, and a marionette stage, all planned and constructed by the students. The department also publishes the *Speech Semi-Annual*, which is mailed free of charge to high schools in all sections of the country.

The Department finances itself by means of the presentation each year of six one-act plays, known as the "Six-In-One," by the annual school play, and also by renting costumes. W. N. Viola is in charge of Speech activities in the Pontiac High School.

One of the favorite questions for debate in the East this past winter has been that of the fitness of New York's governor for the presidency. It is interesting that in debates between Harvard University and Boston College, between Princeton and Brown, and between Amherst and Princeton, it was decided in each case that Alfred E. Smith was real presidential material.

DRAMATIC ACTIVITIES

The completion of the Bascom Theatre at the University of Wisconsin has greatly stimulated dramatic activities there. Plans are now under way to associate more closely the interests of the entire state. The Wisconsin Dramatic Guild, now in the process of formation, expects to have a formal constitution adopted by April or May. A high-school tournament has been organized, the finals to be held in Madison, probably at the time of the final debates of the Wisconsin High-School Forensic Association. The Guild will also sponsor contests between college clubs, rural and urban community clubs, and church clubs.

The Bureau of Dramatic Activities of the University, which is planning this enlarged dramatic program, also offers advice and aid in choosing plays, staging, costuming, and lighting problems, designing of auditoriums and stages, direction of plays, and even the forming of active organizations.

In cooperation with the Department of Speech, the Extension Division is planning to hold an intensive Institute for teachers who are interested in dramatics during the first two weeks of the Summer Session. Regular courses, carrying university credit, will be offered.

During the first semester of the year the classes in dramatics at West Virginia University presented twenty one-act plays before the class and instructional staff. All these plays were coached by students and all parts were taken by students.

For the past eight years the Dramatic Club, which is sponsored by the Department of Public Speaking, has presented two or three major plays each year in a down-town theatre. Last spring this theatre was burned. This fall the club had an opportunity to lease a small theatre seating five hundred and also all the equipment, for a period of eight months at a rental of approximately three thousand dollars. A contract was signed and the management of the theatre taken over. A student staff was organized and a Board of Directors appointed made up of students and townspeople. The name of the theatre was changed to The University Playhouse. The opening was set for the last three days of National Drama Week. The opening play was *The Pelican*, which was coached by Miss Constance Welch, a member of the Public Speaking faculty. The second play, to be given the second week of March, is *The Family Upstairs* and will be coached by Miss Ruth Simonson of the faculty. It is the policy of the club to give a major play every two weeks for the remainder of the year and to give groups of one-act plays and vaudeville acts in the intervals between. It is the aim and hope of the club eventually to obtain a campus theatre.

The club has won the first prize at the Northwestern University Theatre Tournament at Evanston twice in succession and is the only holder of the Cumnock Cup. This year the club has entered a play in the Pittsburgh Drama Tournament, which is to be held on April 16th.

Professor Wilbur Jones Kay organized the club in 1920 and has been its sponsor and treasurer since. Ellingwood Wilson Kay, a senior in the university, is president of the club.

The Oral Arts Association of Southern California presented a five-day program at Los Angeles shortly before Christmas. One of the features of the program each day was a reading by Ralph Dennis, Dean of the School of Speech of Northwestern University, whose programs included *Bill of Divorcement, Aunt Polly's Story of Mankind, Tristram, If Winter Comes,* and a lecture on "A Traveler Observes."

A student program of plays was presented one night: "The No 'Count Boy," by the Manual Arts High School; *Not Quite Such A Goose*, by the Huntington Park High School; *The Illuminati in Drama Libre*, by the Fairfax High School; and scenes from *Hamlet* by the Franklin High School.

The University of Iowa is rejoicing in the completion of the University Theatre, which is a part of the Iowa Union project. Major full-length production there this year have been: *The Poor Nut, The Square Peg, Number Seventeen, Saint Joan, What Every Woman Knows, The Wisdom Tooth,* and an original long play.

Major dramatic productions for the first half of the second semester at Cornell University included *The Honorable Bashville,* by George Bernard Shaw; *The School of Princesses,* by Jacinto Benevente; *Alice in Wonderland,* adapted from Lewis Carroll's story by Alice Gerstenberg; and the following one-act plays: *The Turtle Dove,* by Margaret Oliver; *Close the Book,* by Susan Glaspell; *The Rest Cure,* by Gertrude E. Jennings; and *O'Flaherty, V. C.,* by G. B. Shaw.

Performances of two interesting plays were given recently at Syracuse University: *The Changelings,* by Lee Wilson Dodd, was given for the first time by an amateur group; and *Mister Pitt,* a play in thirteen scenes and three interludes, by Zona Gale.

An impressive performance of *Iphigenia in Tauris* was given recently at the University of Vermont.

Enter Madame, by Dolly Byrne and Gilda Varesi, presented late in February, was the first production at the New Jersey College for Woman in which the staging, producing, costuming, and make-up were carried out by the students. Mrs. Jane Inge is the new head of the college dramatic department.

The Laboratory Players, of Columbia University, are engaged in a novel program—the work of portraying faithfully the drama of a century or more ago. Beginning in April 1926 with *The Contrast,* by Royall Tyler, they have produced James Nelson

Barker's *Superstition*, John Howard Payne's *Clari, or the Maid of Milan*, William Dunlap's *The Father of an Only Child* (the play witnessed by George Washington on the night of his first inauguration as President of the United States), Mrs. Frances Sheridan's *The Discovery*, and *The Forest Rose, or American Farmers*, by Samuel Woodworth. The final performance of this year will be a Shakespearian play, *A Winter's Tale*. Mrs. Estelle H. Davis is in charge of the activities of the group.

PERSONALS

Lew Sarett has returned to his work in the School of Speech, Northwestern University, after a year's sabbatical leave, the last two months of which he devoted to a lecture tour, on which he spoke in most of the larger cities, normal schools and colleges between Nebraska and New York. Besides his usual courses in the School of Speech—Persuasion, The Teaching of Speech, and a Seminar in Speech—he is offering a course in Building the Lyceum Lecture and Lecture-recital.

Anthony Blanks, of the Department of Speech in the University of California, has just been granted the Ph. D. by Stanford University, where he has been teaching this year. He expects to return next year to the University of California as Associate Professor.

Marvin G. Bauer, formerly of the Speech Department of Iowa State College, is now at Washington and Lee University, where he has charge of the work in Public Speaking. He will offer courses in the second term of the summer session at the University of Denver.

Miss Annah Jo Pendleton is Acting Head of the Department of Public Speaking at Texas Technological College, in the absence of Miss Ruth Pirtle.

Carroll P. Lahman, of the Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Michigan, was recently elected to membership-at-large in Delta Sigma Rho.

Miss Anna Carr, who recently received her Master's degree at the University of Iowa, has left her graduate study at the University of Wisconsin, where she spent the first semester of this year, to introduce work in Speech Correction in Wausau, Wisconsin.